

Regional Action Plan for the implementation of the **New Urban Agenda** in Latin America and the Caribbean

2016-2036



MINURVI

UN HABITAT
FOR A BETTER URBAN FUTURE

Regional Action Plan for the implementation of the **New Urban Agenda** in Latin America and the Caribbean

2016-2036



The preparation of this document was coordinated by the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) in cooperation with UN-Habitat and the Forum of Ministers and High-Level Authorities on Housing and Urban Development in Latin America and the Caribbean (MINURVI) within the collaborative framework for the implementation of the New Urban Agenda in Latin America and the Caribbean.

The publication and printing of this version of the document was prepared to allow for presentation, discussion and dissemination during the October 2017 Cities Conference at ECLAC's headquarters in Santiago, Chile. The results of the conference will be incorporated within a new version of the document for subsequent publication.

The views expressed in this document, which has been reproduced without formal editing, are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Organization.

United Nations publication
LC/TS.2017/77
Distribution: Limited
Copyright © United Nations, September 2017. All rights reserved
Printed at United Nations, Santiago
S.17-00896

Applications for authorization to reproduce this work in whole or in part should be sent to the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), Publications and Web Services Division, publicaciones@cepal.org. Member States and their governmental institutions may reproduce this work without prior authorization, but are requested to mention the source and to inform ECLAC of such reproduction.

Coordinating team:

ECLAC: Ricardo Jordán, Office of the Executive Secretary and Chief of the Human Settlements Unit of the Sustainable Development and Human Settlements Division, with the collaboration of Lucy Winchester, Sophie Devine, Katherine Indvik, Maylis Labarthe, Juliet Braslow, Vera Kiss and Fiona Littlejohn-Castillo, and secretarial support from Carla López, Ignacia Alvarado and María Paz Rivera.

UN-Habitat: Elkin Velásquez, Director of the Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean (ROLAC), with the collaboration of Sergio Blanco, Pablo Vaggione, Roberto Lippi and Efrén Osorio.

MINURVI: Marina Klemensiewicz, in representation of the MINURVI Presidency pro tempore, as well as for the Undersecretary of Habitat and Human Development of the Ministry of Interior, Public Works and Housing of Argentina, with the support of Tamara Parma and Mariana Barrera, and with the contributions of all MINURVI member countries.

The contributions and feedback provided by the following members of the Expert Group consulted throughout the preparation of this document are gratefully acknowledged:

Abdullahi Abdulkadri, Marta Aguilar, Pablo Aguilar González, Salvador Alejo Tunco, Derek Alleyne, Guillermo Alomia, Magdalena Álvarez, Abraham Walter Apaza Condori, Claudia Arce Reyes, Dante Arenas, Sergio Arrieta, Yamil Asch, Esteban Balarezo, Renato Balbim, David Barrio, Sergio Barrios, Jonathan Barton, Terry Bascombe, Joan Frederick Baudet Ferreira França, Omar Bello, Víctor Raúl Benítez González, Lucila Bensegues, Ciro Biderman, Sergio Blanco, Luis Bonilla Ortiz-Arrieta, Darrel Bradley, Luis Eduardo Bresciani, María Buhigas, Sirlly Edelis Castro Tuiran, Roberto Celano, Anaclaudia Marinheiro Centeno Rossbach, Juan Carlos Cristaldo, Luis Mauricio Cuervo, Mark Cummins, Inés da Silva Magalhães, Graciela Dede, María del Carmen, Javier Delgadillo, Roberto Ariel Devoto, Sonia María Días, Francisco Donoso D., Michael Donovan, Juan Pablo Duhalde, Julio Echeverría, Beatriz Fernández, Nelson Fernández, Clifton Forde, Karla França, Pablo Fuentes Flores, Christy Ganzert Pato, Luis Garrido, Pablo Giménez, Jorge Giorno, Alfredo Godoy, Simón González, Sharon Griffith, Verónica Guzmán, Joanni Henrichs, Tereza Herling, Víctor Hugo, Kelly Hunte, Alfonso Xavier Iracheta Cenecorta, Juan Pablo Jiménez, Paola Jirón, Nicole Johnson, Alies Jordan, Dorothea Kallenberger, Marina Klemensiewicz, Angelina Lesieux, Pablo López, Lautaro Lorenzo, Joan MacDonald, Mark Majors, Patricia Mancuello, Daniela Mastrangelo, Tadashi Matsumoto, José Rafael Mena Giacometti, Asad Mohammed, Livia Monteiro, Daniel Montgomery, Karen Muñoz, Michelle Mycoo, Mariela Nao, Jeffrey Núñez, Olenka Ochoa Berreteaga, Hely Olivares, Gustavo Raúl Ordoñez Puente, Lewis O'Reilly, Jennifer Ortiz, Tamara Parma, Karl Peet, Rosendo Pujol Mesalles, Diane Quarless, Robin Rajack, Sohel Rana, Eduardo Reese, Johannes Rehner, Bernardo Requena Blanco, Daniel Reyes, Barbara Carolina Richards Rojas, Sebastián Roca, Alfredo Rodríguez, Jorge Rodríguez, Eduardo Rojas, María Soledad Saborido, Andrés Sanabria, Jesús Sánchez, Paulo Sandroni, Junia Santa Rosa, Ramón Santelices Tello, Marian Santos, Nelson Saule, Olga Segovia, Paola Siclari Bravo, Pablo Xavier Sigüenza Clavijo, Lucas Smarke, Pauline Stockins, Ana Sugranyes, Claudio Sule Fernandez, Maricarmen Tapia Gómez, Frank Téllez Alonso, Emilio Thodes Miranda, Daniel Todtmann Montandon, Carolyn Trench Sandiford, Pablo Vaggione, José Wendes de Oliveira, Alicia Williner and Carolina Zambrano Barragán.

The contributions of these institutions and agencies are also recognized:

Asociación de Municipalidades Ecuatorianas, Asociación Nacional de Empresas de Servicios Sanitarios A.G. Andes, Caribbean Association of Local Government Authorities, Caribbean Development Bank, Caribbean Network for Urban and Land Management, Caribbean Planners Association, Sustainable Development Centre (CEDEUS), Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS), Cities Alliance, Colegio Mexiquense, Colegio Nacional de Jurisprudencia Urbanística, Confederación Nacional de Municipios de Brasil, CAF-Development Bank for Latin America, Departamento Nacional de Planeación de Colombia, Despacio-Colombia, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), Facultad de Arquitectura de la Universidad Nacional de Asunción, Federación Latinoamericana de Ciudades, Municipios y Asociaciones Municipalistas (FLACMA), Fundação Getúlio Vargas, Fundación Avina, Fundación Joao Pinheiro, Global Land Tool Network (GLTN), Gobierno Municipal de Sairé - Pernambuco, Brasil, Habitat for Humanity, Instituto de la Ciudad de Quito, Instituto de la Vivienda - Universidad de Chile, Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada (Ipea), Instituto Pólis, Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), Mercociudades, Ministerio de Comunicaciones, Infraestructura y Vivienda de la República de Guatemala, Ministerio de Desarrollo Urbano y Vivienda de Ecuador, Ministerio de Obras Públicas de Chile, Ministerio de Obras Públicas, Servicios y Vivienda de Bolivia, Ministerio de Planificación Federal, Inversión Pública y Servicios de Argentina, Ministerio de Vivienda y Asentamientos Humanos de Costa Rica, Ministerio de Vivienda y Urbanismo de Chile, Municipalidad de San Antonio de Areco de Argentina, Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Partnership on Sustainable, Low Carbon Transport (SLoCaT), Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Subsecretaría de Hábitat y Desarrollo Humano de la República Argentina, Subsecretaría de Planificación Territorial de la Inversión Pública de la República Argentina, SUR - Corporación de Estudios Sociales y Educación, TECHO Chile, TECHO International, Unidad de Gestión Estratégica Cantonal – GAD Municipal del Cantón Cuenca, Unión Interamericana para la Vivienda (UNIAPRAVI), University of the West Indies and Women in Informal Employment: Globalizing and Organizing (WIEGO).

Contents

Forward.....	7
A. Introduction	9
I. Habitat I y II	9
II. Habitat III and the New Urban Agenda	9
B. Regional Action Plan for the implementation of the New Urban Agenda in Latin America and the Caribbean 2016-2036	11
I. Background	11
II. Objectives.....	12
III. Methodology.....	12
1. Document development.....	12
2. Expert groups	13
3. Cities Conference	14
C. Regional challenges and opportunities (diagnostic).....	15
D. Strategic framework.....	23
I. Global agreements and relevant international agendas	23
II. Vision and mission for sustainable development in the region	24
1. Regional vision for cities and human settlements	24
2. Regional mission	24
III. Guiding principles, key strategic outcomes and cross cutting perspectives	24
1. Cross cutting perspectives	24
2. Guiding principles and strategic objectives (2016-2036)	25
E. Action areas	29
I. Action Area 1: National urban policies	30
II. Action Area 2: Urban legal frameworks	34
III. Action Area 3: Urban and territorial planning and design	39
IV. Action Area 4: Financing urbanization	44
V. Action Area 5: Local implementation	48
VI. Action Area 6: Monitoring, reporting and revision mechanisms.....	51

F.	Next steps towards implementation and monitoring	55
I.	Actors, roles and responsibilities.....	55
II.	Subregional Action Plans	55
III.	National Action Plans	56
IV.	City Plans	56
V.	Monitoring and evaluating the Regional Action Plan	56
	Bibliography	57

Forward

The Regional Action Plan (RAP) is a regional proposal that builds on the global framework for the implementation of the New Urban Agenda. The New Urban Agenda is the principal outcome document of the third United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development, Habitat III, held in Quito, Ecuador in October 2016. The implementation of the New Urban Agenda in Latin America and the Caribbean is fundamental to the development of all countries in the region, and to ensuring their sustainable future. The demographic, economic, social and political characteristics and conditions of the cities of Latin America and the Caribbean are determinants of sustainable development in the region, positioning urbanization processes and the sustainability of cities and human settlements as key components to the region's development priorities.

The RAP proposes interventions and actions, as well as relevant policy priorities to promote sustainable urban development in the region. The Plan is a proposal to maximize the central role of cities and human settlements as motors for sustainable development in an ever-increasingly urbanized world. In order to achieve sustainable, resilient, safe and inclusive cities, the region needs routes, methodologies and tools to guide urbanization. The Plan offers a roadmap towards urban sustainable development in the region, which must be reviewed, analyzed and adapted to each national, subnational and city context. The Regional Action Plan is a valuable reference to promote and orient the effective implementation of the New Urban Agenda in the region, and achieve sustainable urban development.

The publication and printing of this version of the RAP was coordinated for presentation, discussion and dissemination during the Cities Conference at ECLAC's headquarters in Santiago, Chile (October 2-6, 2017).

A. Introduction

I. Habitat I y II

In 1976, the United Nations General Assembly convened the first United Nations Conference on Human Settlements, Habitat I. The conference responded to recent shifts in global demographic patterns, drew attention to the emerging consequences of a rapid urbanization especially in developing countries, and established the need to foster, promote and create sustainable human settlements.

Twenty years later, the second United Nations Conference on Human Settlements, Habitat II took place in Istanbul in 1996, where the priorities and commitments set out for sustainable urban development in the previous conference were reaffirmed. The "Habitat Agenda" was adopted as a global action plan to ensure adequate housing for all and to recognize the key role of sustainable human settlements in the development of an increasingly urbanized world.

Despite initiatives and progress made within the framework of the previous two Habitat conferences, the current urban development model has not been able to respond to such critical issues as urban poverty, social exclusion and other international and regional priorities. Recognizing these challenging conditions and the significant concentration of the world population in cities (more than 50%) with projections of an increase of up to two-thirds by 2050, Habitat III and the New Urban Agenda affirm a new leading role of cities and urban development for the achievement of sustainable development at a global scale.

II. Habitat III and the New Urban Agenda

The United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development, Habitat III, took place in Quito, Ecuador from 17 to 20 October 2016. The third in the Habitat series, the United Nations General Assembly convened the conference (Resolution 66/2017) to strengthen global commitments for sustainable urbanization and urban development, focusing on the implementation of a new urban agenda (United Nations, 2012a).

The main outcome of Habitat III was the official adoption of the final New Urban Agenda (NUA) document by member states of the United Nations. The NUA is the new mandate for the development of cities and human settlements over the next 20 years. Comprised of 175 paragraphs, the NUA is an action-based strategic proposal intended to orient policy, programs and projects and to

create an urban paradigm change to guide sustainable urban development over the next 20 years. It establishes "a shared vision for a better and more sustainable future —one in which all people have equal rights and access to the benefits and opportunities that cities can offer, and in which the international community reconsiders the urban systems and physical form of our urban spaces to achieve this" (United Nations, 2016a). The NUA appears as a road map for the creation of cities that are places for prosperity, culture, social welfare and environmental protection.

Habitat III takes place at a defining moment in the international development agendas. Between 2014 and 2016, the global agreements of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Paris Agreement, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Reduction, and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development, recognized the need for a sustainable development which balances and integrates its economic, social and environmental dimensions, while at the same time referencing the importance of urbanization processes and the way in which our cities and human settlements are planned, managed and built. In the process leading to the articulation of the Agenda 2030, several actors, including former Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon and his High-Level Panel of eminent persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda pointed out that it is in cities where the battle for sustainable development will be won or lost (United Nations, 2012b, 2013 and 2015a).

The Agenda 2030 presents the urban sphere as a transversal issue for sustainable development, marking a profound change from the sectorial approach of the Millennium Development Goals. The incorporation of Objective 11, "Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable", in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, as one of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) was decisive, as it located urbanization and urban and territorial development at the heart of sustainable development, recognizing its importance for the wellbeing of the population and for social and environmental economic development. As stated in the NUA, "we have reached a critical point in understanding that cities can be the source of solutions to, rather than the cause of, the challenges that our world is facing today. If well-planned and well-managed, urbanization can be a powerful tool for sustainable development for both developing and developed countries" (United Nations, 2016a).

The NUA was developed through an extensive preparatory process that included the participation of multiple actors, in which the Latin American and Caribbean region (LAC) had an active role. Among the activities carried out in the region as part of the preparatory process for Habitat III is the: report prepared by the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) and the Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean (ROLAC) of UN-Habitat (2016), in collaboration with the Forum of Ministers and High-Level Authorities on Housing and Urban Development in Latin America and the Caribbean (MINURVI); the Regional Report prepared by UN-Habitat and ECLAC for presentation and discussion in Habitat III; and the national reports prepared by a number of region's countries to evaluate the changes and advances in urban development in the period since 1996 in order to analyze the scope of the implementation of the Habitat Agenda II. These documents served to inform the NUA and provide an important baseline for the implementation phase of the NUA in the region.

In line with the commitments made in Habitat III, ECLAC and UN-Habitat, in collaboration with more than 125 regional experts associated with various stakeholder groups (ministries, local governments, academia, NGOs, development banks and the private sector) have developed this Regional Action Plan to guide the implementation of the NUA in the region.

B. Regional Action Plan for the implementation of the New Urban Agenda in Latin America and the Caribbean 2016-2036

I. Background

The Forum of Ministers and High-Level Authorities on Housing and Urban Development of Latin America and the Caribbean (MINURVI) recognized the need for a Regional Action Plan for the implementation of the NUA in the region and the "the exchange of knowledge and experiences for the strengthening of national policies" in the Asunción Declaration (2016) of the XXV General Assembly of MINURVI as well as in Habitat III. A Regional Report (2016), entitled "Latin America and the Caribbean: Challenges, dilemmas and commitments towards an agenda for urban development," prepared by MINURVI with the collaboration of ECLAC, UN-HABITAT and the French Regional Cooperation for Habitat III. ECLAC and UN-Habitat received a request to facilitate the development of the RAP as well as a regional observatory-platform.

During Habitat III, the Executive Secretary of ECLAC made explicit ECLAC's commitment to support MINURVI in the implementation and monitoring of the NUA in the region and, more specifically, in the creation of a regional observatory-platform to monitor the development and implementation of the NUA and the RAP.

The NUA highlights the role of regional organizations, particularly those of the United Nations, such as ECLAC and UN-HABITAT, in strengthening the coordination of urban and territorial development strategies and programs, and in applying an integrated approach to sustainable urbanization, and thus supporting the implementation of the NUA.

The United Nation's Regional Commissions are in a unique position to facilitate regional commitments by Member States and local governments to enable the development of a Regional Action Plan and to promote commitment for subregional, national and subnational action. The regional level provides a key link between global frameworks and national and local agendas.

II. Objectives

The Regional Action Plan seeks to be a key strategic framework and reference for Latin American and Caribbean cities and human settlements, and a tool for promoting the implementation of the NUA in LAC, steering national and sub-national development. It is intended as a regional guide, both adaptable to local conditions and needs, and capable of building synergies with existing global agreements and agendas.

Among its general objectives, the RAP seeks to support the consolidation of “cities and human settlements where all people can fully exercise all rights and freedoms, an indispensable condition to reduce structural gaps that plague the population of our countries and cities, such as poverty, insecurity and violence, social and territorial inequity, and vulnerability to the effects of climate change” as recognized in the Toluca Declaration, signed during the regional preparatory meeting for Habitat III.

As a strategic regional proposal, the RAP serves to locate and adapt the NUA to the reality and conditions of LAC: it takes into account the regional opportunities and challenges that emanate from the global agenda. The RAP establishes the NUA's global commitments as a platform that enables countries in the region to develop responses and implement concrete actions aligned with and congruent to NUA commitments. The RAP articulates regional priorities for inclusive, prosperous and sustainable development and the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in the region, reflecting both the regional challenges and opportunities associated with urbanization processes.

Just as the NUA promotes a paradigm shift, the RAP's fundamental objective is to produce structural changes for sustainable development and equality within urbanization processes. The RAP recognizes the need for major changes in many areas of urban planning and management in order to achieve sustainable urban development and seeks to highlight critical elements for this transformative change process.

Today, more than ever, the region needs routes, methods and tools to guide urbanization towards sustainable, safe, resilient and inclusive human settlements and cities. The Regional Action Plan seeks to be an effective tool for guiding the implementation of the NUA and achieving sustainable cities in the region.

It should be noted that the RAP has been designed as a holistic and transversal document; its proposals for achieving sustainable urban development are integral and comprehensive. As such, it does not seek to prioritize subregional, national and local actions and needs: these should be worked out in collective and participatory processes at the appropriate national and subnational levels, based on the strategic framework and the action areas of the Plan.

III. Methodology

1. Document development

The process of developing the RAP has been carried out since October 2016, jointly coordinated by ECLAC, UN-Habitat and MINURVI. The initial proposal was elaborated from an analysis of the following main documents along with an extensive literature review:

- Documents prepared during the Habitat III preparatory process including: documents resulting from the preparatory process, *policy documents*, *thematic documents*, *urban dialogues*, the document resulting from the Regional Meeting for Latin America and the Caribbean Habitat III, in Toluca, Mexico, and the *statements* of thematic meetings;

- The New Urban Agenda (United Nations, 2016a);
- The Action Framework for the Implementation of the New Urban Agenda (UN-Habitat, 2017);
- The Regional Report of MINURVI (2016), entitled "Latin America and the Caribbean: Challenges, dilemmas and commitments toward a common urban agenda", prepared by MINURVI with the collaboration of ECLAC, UN-HABITAT and the French Regional Cooperation;
- The Regional Report for Habitat III of ECLAC and UN-Habitat (2016) entitled *Sustainable Cities with Equality* prepared in collaboration with various experts representing civil society, ministries, local governments, academia, the private sector and the United Nations;
- Transforming our world: 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (United Nations, 2015b);
- Agenda 2030 y los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible: una oportunidad para América Latina y el Caribe (ECLAC, 2017a);
- Horizontes 2030: Equality at the center of development (ECLAC, 2016);
- The Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development (United Nations, 2015e);
- The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 (United Nations, 2012c), and
- The Paris Agreement on Climate Change (UNFCCC, 2015).

The initial proposal was shared among main counterparts and ECLAC, while a group of experts was invited to participate in a collaborative process of document development and revision.

2. Expert groups

ECLAC and UN-HABITAT convened a group of experts in March 2017, who participated in a series of both group and bilateral meetings between April and August of 2017. To facilitate a collaborative process and a critical reflection on the preliminary drafts of the RAP, the meetings were organized to allow for critical dialogue, exchange and feedback: experts had the opportunity to provide both dialogued input and written comments. The process permitted the incorporation of inputs and comments from a diversity of regional and international experts, as well as a broad participation in its elaboration process.

More than 125 experts from 15 countries in the region participated in expert group meetings of multiple stakeholder groups. These included ministries of housing and urban development, and of planning and public works from the region, subnational and local governments, municipal confederations, NGOs, research institutes and universities, development banks and the private sector, together with ECLAC and UN-Habitat experts.

The main message of the expert meetings was the need to develop an action plan that responds to regional opportunities and challenges, and that strongly supports the appropriation of the strategic framework and its actions by national and subnational actors in their local agendas. Also, the importance of having a RAP that facilitates the consolidation of the strategic actions necessary to jointly advance in the fulfillment of all the relevant global agendas was highlighted.

3. Cities Conference

The Cities Conference is being held at ECLAC headquarters in Santiago, Chile, from October 2 to 6, 2017 and offers a significant opportunity to strengthen and enrich this important regional document with the input of diverse regional and international actors.

One year on from Habitat III, the conference focuses on the discussion and reflection on the strategic aspects and mechanisms of implementation of the NUA in LAC, paying particular attention to the Regional Action Plan.

Among its main objectives, the conference seeks to bring together stakeholders involved in urban planning and management and urban and territorial development to discuss the benefits of, and commitments for the implementation and monitoring of the Regional Action Plan and the NUA in the region. The conference thus constitutes a strategic platform for dialogue on the implementation of NUA in LAC, and to contribute to the achievement of the SDGs, in particular SDG 11.

C. Regional challenges and opportunities (diagnostic)

The significant economic and demographic weight of cities in Latin America and the Caribbean make urbanization and urban development central to the development of our countries. Within the region, urban centers account for 80% of the regional population and generate about two-thirds of the gross domestic product of the countries of the region. By 2030, this economic weight will continue to grow in the region, albeit to a lesser extent than on a global scale. The demographic, economic, social and political importance of cities is decisive in the sustainable development of the region. Urbanization and sustainable urban development articulate and condition the development of countries in LAC, in fact, the internal development of the countries of the region depends on the sustainability of their system of cities and human settlements. ECLAC and UN-HABITAT (2016) highlight in their recent regional report prepared for Habitat III that the sustainable future of the region is closely linked to sustainable urbanization, recognizing the following major urban patterns and challenges for the region on the basis of tendencies over the last 20 years:

- the need for a new sustainable urban development agenda for the sustainable future of the region;
- the existence of a double transition: urban, in terms of the consolidation of urbanization (reduction of the rate of rural-urban migration) and demographic (reduction of population growth rates and aging of the population) that determines lower rates of growth of cities;
- new patterns of production, distribution and consumption in urban areas, but old structural challenges in urban economies that hinder inclusion and universal access to the benefits of urban development (quality goods and services);
- poverty reduction and greater access to housing, but with increasing inequality, socio-spatial segregation and citizen insecurity;
- increased vulnerability, taking into account the effects of climate change with unequal socio-territorial impacts and the growth of the ecological footprint of cities;
- the recognition of the city as a macro public good and the need to guarantee economic, social, environmental and cultural rights within the framework of the right to the city.

To meet these challenges and opportunities, the implementation of the NUA in LAC, and a regional action plan to guide it, are critical.

Urban primacy in LAC implies that many national development issues are made concrete and manifested in urban contexts, highlighting cities as key spaces for public policies and programs, and emphasizing the impacts of urban interventions themselves on sustainable development. In the 20 years between Habitat II and the Habitat III, the city emerges as an object and subject of analysis linked to the major challenges of global development and is recognized as a space which has the potential to address all the pillars of sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. The city is understood as a context and condition for the development of various social, economic and environmental processes and not as a reality for only sector or local interventions. It also raises the urban challenge beyond the problems that cities face and recognizes urban areas as spaces that, if well managed, can produce economic, social and environmental value, thus deserving to be considered an integral part of the national policy development and global agendas.

Urbanization and the challenge of tackling inequality are two fundamental aspects for the development of LAC. The region continues to be characterized by high levels of inequality and the current volatile economic and political environment threatens the achievements of the past decades in reducing poverty and closing economic and social gaps (ECLAC and UN-HABITAT, 2016). Although cities and human settlements in LAC are considered centers of opportunity and growth, they are also places characterized by important inequalities, including socioeconomic and spatial segregation, housing access and quality urban services gaps, and the high social, environmental and economic vulnerability affecting large segments of the region's population. Inequality is a characteristic feature of the everyday reality of urban life in the region, and the consolidation of cities and human settlements where all people can fully exercise all rights and freedoms is an indispensable condition to reduce the structural conditions that impact the population of countries and cities, including poverty, insecurity and violence, social and territorial inequity, and vulnerability to the effects of climate change.

Countries and cities in the region are among the most unequal in the world, and although the urban population of LAC living in poverty fell from 41.4% in 1990 to 23.2% in 2013 (ECLAC and UN-HABITAT, 2016), this has not necessarily implied a comparable decline in inequality. Inequality determines conditions of high vulnerability for the urban population, especially for poorer segments. Inequality is spatially expressed in the form of socioeconomic segregation, urban informality, and in persistent challenges in economic accessibility to housing and urban land, and is also associated with high levels of violence and crime (ECLAC and UN-HABITAT, 2016). According to the Gini index, urban inequality at the regional level reaches 0.42 compared to the urban average of the OECD of slightly more than 0.3 points. Although there are variations by country and city, no country has an index of less than 0.4 points, and individual cities show worrying levels of income inequality. According to the Gini index in several LAC countries, urban inequality is often higher than overall country inequality indices.

Inequality stands out among the main challenges of development, in LAC particularly considering the context of structural heterogeneity as a historical feature of the economies and societies of the region. That is, the persistence of a productive structure characterized by low technological absorption and high levels of labor occupation in activities of low productivity which generate structures of political and social power that tend to reproduce inequality (ECLAC, 2016b). Inequality is expressed in cities not only in terms of the income and employment patterns of their residents, but physically in socioeconomic residential segregation, the spatial structures of cities, and the large gaps in urban quality and access to housing and habitat.

Among these gaps it is essential to highlight the persistence of high levels of employment in low productivity sectors, which is related to high-income disparities and limited access to social protection, and thus the creation of formal jobs through growth and productive diversification becomes a fundamental challenge at both national scales and within urban contexts (ECLAC, 2014a). Agglomeration economies are associated with opportunities for the dynamism of urban economies such as the concentration of public goods and capital, access to markets, high density of contacts and conditions for innovation, reduction of transaction costs and opportunities to diversify economic

activities. It is this inherent feature of urban agglomerations to foster human collaboration that the economist Edward Glaeser defines as the main reason behind the existence of cities and thus so can be considered one of the greatest inventions of mankind (Glaeser, 2011).

In spite of the benefits that urban areas can offer for productive, diversified and intensive activities in innovation, according to ECLAC data (2014b), 46.4% of urban workers in LAC are employed in low productivity sectors. The high levels of low productivity activities in the urban economies of the region suggest that the increase in productivity resulting from the urbanization process has been mainly exhausted and the challenge now is to reduce urban structural heterogeneity. In addition, there are higher levels of low-productivity employment among urban women, with 50.1% of them working in these conditions against 43.4% of men (ECLAC, 2014b, Household Survey Database). The region also maintains a low participation among patent applications, reaching only 2% in 2014, as in 1990 (in contrast to China, where this figure increased from 1% to 35% in the same period) (CEPAL, 2016, p. 115). In spite of its high level of urbanization, in LAC cities, the challenge remains to take advantage of the benefits that the urban context can offer to foster intensive activities in knowledge and innovation, as well as opportunities for improvement of productivity and the quality of employment and to close gender inequalities.

Income gaps and access to formal employment also have impacts on the spatial and socio-economic patterns of cities, in particular the unequal access to urban land and housing they imply. It is important to highlight the unfavorable relationship of real estate prices and incomes in LAC, which can reach on average up to three times what is observed in the United States, added on to the fact that interest rates of mortgages in the region are considerably higher than in OECD countries (Blanco et al., 2014). Under these conditions, the formal housing market is inaccessible to many households, and there is a lack of incentives for the private sector to participate in the provision of housing for the poorest sectors. In terms of access to housing, it is also important to highlight the persistence of precarious settlements in the cities, although several governments in the region have made progress on legal norms and interventions at both national and local levels addressing the issue with regularization of tenure and interventions to formalize and improve the urban quality of slums. Twenty one percent of the urban population in the region lives in this situation—and in some countries more than half of the urban population. Urban informality therefore remains a fundamental challenge for equality in cities (UN-HABITAT, 2014a). Precarious access to basic services in many informal settings also negatively impacts the time spent on household chores in these households, which can affect women's time use in particular (UN-Habitat, 2013).

The dynamics of access to housing and urban land have also contributed to the formation of cities characterized by residential socioeconomic segregation, which in many cases implies the concentration of income levels and lower socioeconomic indicators in the peripheral areas of cities (ECLAC, 2014b). However, in the last decade contradictory trends have been observed in the area of residential segregation, due to the phenomenon of social diversification and the improvement of economic conditions in peripheral areas of cities. Part of this phenomenon is the influx of people with higher income levels into these areas, in the general context of population growth in peripheral areas in cities of LAC (ECLAC, 2014b). However, it is worth noting that with the proliferation of closed condominiums and the use of private services, including education (ECLAC, 2014a, p. 95), the trend does not necessarily imply an increase in social integration in the peripheries.

The adoption of housing policies in some countries based on the ABC (*Ahorro, bono, crédito* in Spanish) model of subsidized mortgages (Savings, Subsidies, Credit model) have contributed to the reduction of the quantitative housing deficit and in some countries access to housing has been improved for the most vulnerable groups. However, the incentives to build in peripheral areas where land is cheaper have also driven peripheral urban growth and the concentration of lower income groups in these contexts (Bonomo et al., 2015). The policy approach in subsidizing the final purchase of housing has therefore played a role in peripheral growth, and, with some exceptions (Chile, Uruguay), has neglected alternatives such as leasing policies or the recovery of central urban areas to

provide social housing. Segregation as a spatial expression of inequalities has a number of negative effects, including differential access to quality urban services and facilities and the large distance of residential areas from the urban centers that concentrate jobs and services.

In turn, the shape and character of cities not only expresses economic conditions, but also ways of living and social aspirations. The search for territorial exclusivity and the desire for segregated modes of urban life contribute to the deepening of spatial inequalities. In this context it is important to remember that the rates of socioeconomic residential segregation are systematically higher for the richer groups (ECLAC, 2014b, page 226), i.e., segregation is not only associated with poverty but also with wealth. Architectural forms and spatial planning also express preferences for modes of segregated coexistence, largely driven by the perception of insecurity in public spaces (Caldeira, 2000).

In this context, there is a trend towards the generation of public spaces of private use and management, more clearly expressed in the proliferation of commercial centers and in the real estate production of closed or walled condominiums. Added to this is the emergence and expansion of forms of residential construction that are characterized by large distances between buildings (in contrast to the continuous facades of historic cities), and the separation of frequently walled buildings from the street. As empirical studies show, pedestrian activity is systematically reduced in streets dominated by walls as in streets characterized by empty spaces between buildings. These same architectural forms are associated with lower levels of commercial activity at the street level and a greater perception of insecurity (Netto, 2016). It is worth noting that in the region crime is the main concern of citizens, over issues such as employment or health (CAF, 2014). It is in this sense that individual preferences for segregated livelihoods and the incentives of real estate production to satisfy it are associated with negative effects on public spaces, producing and deepening fragmented cities both in spatial terms and in ways of social coexistence.

In addition to their economic and social effects, urban inequalities in Latin America also pose challenges for environmental sustainability. Environmental degradation, pollution of air quality, and the urban contribution to emissions associated with climate change, pose urgent challenges for cities. In order to reverse this triple condition (economic, social and environmental), it is necessary to revise the mechanisms and forms for urban investments in order to seek a greater social impact. The proposal for the formation of a new economy for social impact appears as an opportunity to implement the NUA paradigm, along with proposals for eco-efficient urban investments in the context of countries that present deficits in urban infrastructure and services.

In LA access to private consumption has increased in recent decades: for example, between 2001 and 2010 the number of cars increased from 391 per 1000 inhabitants to 471 in Mexico City, and in Bogota from 126 to 163 vehicles per 1000 inhabitants (ECLAC, 2014c, p. 254). However, significant gaps remain in relation to quality public goods and services, including public transport. The patterns of consumption that emerge from this context contribute greatly to negative environmental impacts. In fact, the low price elasticity of gasoline demand observed in the region (-0.39) compared to the average of the OECD countries (-0.46) suggests the probable shortage of adequate substitutes for private transportation (ECLAC, 2014c, p. 254).

It is worth noting that cities that do not provide mobility-friendly and pedestrian-friendly conditions, favoring cars or encouraging real estate construction that adversely affect pedestrian traffic, and may contribute to the preference for motorized alternatives. In the region, 38% of urban emissions of greenhouse gases originate from the burning of fossil fuels for transportation (vs. 17% of the industry) (UN-Habitat 2012), which is also a major source of air pollution in a region where many major cities are characterized by concentrations of particulate material far higher than international health norms recommend (ECLAC, 2014c). In this sense, urban development that favors private consumption patterns and does not value more efficient public goods and services (transport mode or the urban quality of streets and other public spaces) also produces negative environmental impacts.

When considering the impacts of transport in cities, it is important to remember that it is not only the mode of transport that impacts the environment, but also the mobility patterns associated with the urban form. The expansion of cities, the configuration of urban density, land uses (mixed or not) all affect the way people and goods circulate throughout the city. To this are added the location and distribution of services and infrastructure that influence the use of time to complete the tasks associated with the reproduction of daily life. The urban expansion that in many cases coincides with the reduction of density poses a global challenge, including for LAC, and has important impacts for the increase of vehicular mobility and, thus, emissions and contamination levels, as well as for high economic and social costs (Litman, 2015).

In LA per capita land use has declined from its very high rate prior to the 1990s, and since 2000 shows a more moderate increase. However, both in terms of per capita land use and in terms of total urban sprawl, many major cities in the region show a pattern of expansion. Urban sprawl, particularly without adequate land use planning and mobility, increases the costs of providing services and infrastructure. In addition, it generates negative environmental impacts such as the consumption of land in natural areas, and pressures on biodiversity and ecosystems in the territory, including the watersheds on which the cities depend. Expansion of construction coverage without adequate planning also limits the ability of green areas to regulate temperature in cities and the ability of the soil to absorb rainwater, creating risks such as heat islands and floods, with negative impacts on the health and wellbeing of the population. The context of climate change and its impacts (average temperature increase, change in precipitation patterns, etc.) also highlight the importance of urban resilience and its integration in the way the city is planned and developed (ECLAC, 2014c).

Urban expansion without planning or integration with policies of mass mobility contributes not only to pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, but is associated with long travel times, which impacts the efficiency of distribution and the quality of life of citizens. According to ECLAC time-use surveys (2017b), the total travel time to the place of employment in the capital cities is at least one hour higher than the national average.

In the context of segregated cities, with large spatial differences between different income groups, and the fact that accessible housing is often located in areas far from centers, including subsidized housing in mono-functional areas, it is likely that long commutes will unequally affect people with lower resources. Long commutes negatively impact the quality of life, individual spending on mobility, and can influence different levels of access to places and employment opportunities. Gender gaps can also be deepened with regard to access to employment, since the selection of a job also depends on the households' time demands, so the time spent on long commutes may limit women. In the efforts towards more efficient and egalitarian cities, it should not be overlooked that men and women have different needs with regard to urban goods and services and there are gender differences in patterns of mobility in the city and in the use of public spaces. Promoting more egalitarian cities must therefore recognize and integrate the gender perspective into their planning and decision making process.

It is important to note the links between inequality, urban form and environmental impacts, which are gaining increasing importance in the context of climate change. Externalities such as pollution, degradation, spatial deterioration, insalubrity and congestion, among others, are unevenly distributed in the urban space in LAC, thus generating uneven vulnerability and differentiated costs. There is evidence of an unequal resilience to these situations by different socio-economic groups. In addition, the population with a less intensive consumption pattern is less responsible for environmental deterioration, which is the one that suffers the consequences, causing problems and challenges of environmental justice in the cities of LAC. Growth without planning and the limited inclusion of environmental considerations in urban policies have been creating situations of vulnerability in the region. A steady increase in the income of individuals and families over the last 20 years has led to a significant increase in the pressure on energy and material resources in cities, thus increasing the conditions of "depletion" of watersheds and of associated territories (hinterlands) with those same cities.

Urban societies need the environmental services provided by ecosystems for their survival and that of future generations. Cities are inserted in a territory and in a natural environment with which they have a close interdependence and depend on the services provided by nature: climate, clean air, winds, stability and soil richness, quantity and quality of water, as well as diversity and vitality of fauna and flora. However, the conversion of a natural ecological system to an urban one has effects on the environment and generates pollution. Moreover, the lack of regulation of urban growth generates a structural deterioration of ecosystems. By destroying ecosystems, we lose natural capital, cultural wealth, environmental services, recreational areas, visual elements of the urban landscape, public health, and food safety, among others. In fact, with few exceptions, protection of urban ecosystems has not been a priority in the region and, in many cases the city has grown to the detriment of spaces of high environmental and biological value (wetlands, forests, creeks, etc.) or, in the case of the Caribbean islands, of its maritime environment.

LAC is highly vulnerable to extreme events; even more so in the Central American and Caribbean subregions. The increase in extreme events related to climate change has meant that risk conditions have increased in recent decades. In cities, the processes of inequality and spatial segregation cause certain sectors to be particularly vulnerable to natural disasters and environmental risks. In the poor sectors, the accelerated and disorderly pace of urbanization is aggravated by the occupation of high-risk lands (slopes of hills, ravines, edges of rivers or channels, unstable lands, etc.) and the use of precarious and unsafe materials. These sectors are most affected when extreme hydro-meteorological events occur and generally suffer the loss of more important assets (e.g., housing), since these sectors do not have formal insurance. There is a strong correlation between more densely populated areas and zones with higher risk levels in LAC, as well as greater vulnerability of cities to climate change, due to the high structural heterogeneity, high levels of inequality and poverty, and the lack of resources to develop adequate infrastructure. Since climate related hydro-meteorological phenomena are projected to increase in frequency and become increasingly extreme, cities are key when designing and implementing mitigation and adaptation measures to hazards. The degree of vulnerability and risk exposure of cities and countries is dynamic and depends on physical, environmental, social, economic, demographic, cultural, institutional and governance factors that are site specific (UN-Habitat, 2012). Poor urban planning and management, lack of awareness of the environment, lack of governance and lack of livelihoods are also significant risk factors for the region's environmental disasters. In LAC, more than 80% of the losses caused by environmental disasters occur in urban centers, and between 40% and 70% in cities with less than 100,000 inhabitants, probably related to weak risk management capacity and low investment in smaller cities (ISDR / UN, 2011, UN-Habitat, 2012).

Therefore, planning sustainable cities involves addressing the links between urban form, sustainable use of resources and social inclusion: achieving more equal and equitable cities is an integral part of addressing environmental sustainability. In cities, promoting urban forms and land uses under these considerations, plays a fundamental role in urban sustainability.

Looking at these dimensions of urban inequality, one can see that cities in LAC express the structural gaps in the region, both in terms of income differences and the ability to generate quality jobs, but also in terms of urban quality in the context of segregation and differentiated access to goods and services. Expressions of inequality, in addition to generating fragmented cities, contribute to environmental challenges, including greenhouse gas emissions and increased exposure to environmental and climatic risks. Given the high concentration of populations in urban areas, interventions in cities provide opportunities to address the region's development challenges, including the historic challenge of inequality and the transition to a more diversified economy and respect for the environment. The links between the urban form, the reproduction of inequalities and the patterns of pollution that these generate, make it clear that a focus on cities with more equality, can also help to generate cities more efficient in the use of resources and more friendly with the environment and at the same time more inclusive for the needs of both women and men. The responses that the countries and cities of LAC will give to this challenge will have an important impact on the sustainable future of the region.

The persistence and depth of urban deficits is evidence of serious institutional deficiencies: those reflected in the lack of national policies and plans for the development of the city system, weaknesses in the governance and financing of subnational governments, and in the absence of an effective coordination between the different levels of government that intervene in the same territory and between neighboring territorial entities within the same level of government. The urban management of cities is weak, with little financial autonomy, low competitiveness, scarce and little public participation and difficulties in land management and environmental risks (IDB, 2016). Urban governance is a key element for sustainable urban development and its quality is a key factor in implementing policies that promote inclusion, resource efficiency and resilience to disasters and other effects of climate change. As the Habitat III Secretariat (2015) points out, urban norms, planning and financing with the consideration of a coherent framework of national urban policies are essential tools for urban development and for the implementation of a new urban agenda. The implementation of these instruments depends to a large extent on the effectiveness of institutional frameworks, the inclusion of different actors, and financing capacities, underlining the central role of urban governance processes.

LAC faces these challenges with important innovative experiences and in turn, with institutional challenges. In the 1990s a process of deregulation began in LAC, where the state lost relative power, and the market accentuated its actions. The urban centers of the region experience a similar situation, where urban planning decreases as a management mechanism, weakening intervention capacities.

The great challenge of the last decades has been how to govern cities and metropolitan systems with populations that can reach millions of inhabitants. The urban stain expands, the economies of agglomeration and location are internalized, but a series of negative externalities occur. This has determined the need for complex urban governance, capable of coordinating the different levels of government of the territories that make up large cities and their relationship with civil society and the private sector. In this challenging context, it is important to strengthen public management and increase the administrative capacities of LAC cities. The Caribbean is particular, as administrative units do not always coincide with urban areas, and sometimes the municipal level is lacking in the governance structure. Another current challenge in the region is the relative scarcity of data and urban information, which constitutes a barrier to the design and implementation of urban policies in LAC. Although urban planning is a political exercise, if it is not done on the basis of research and data analysis, it may result in less efficient and effective policies, programs and projects. Greater collaboration is needed within and between countries in the region, so as to develop institutions and capacity for urban data collection.

In the cities of LAC, there has been an important advance regarding collective rights, materializing in the right to the city, which involves, among others, the demand for access to public spaces, urban land, housing, services and quality equipment. Thanks to the strengthening of social movements, the right to the city has also materialized in greater public participation in LAC and in efforts to increase transparency in public management. In some countries, it is worth highlighting the emergence of urban norms that conceive the city as a common good, recognize the social function of property and introduce instruments of urban inclusion, which is a contribution of the region to the global discussion on "the right to the city" and its role in creating more equitable cities.

On the other hand, urban financing has become another major challenge, where the expansion of urban sprawl makes the provision of public services much more costly and complex. Self-financing is becoming more and more important, for example, by exploring alternatives to recovering capital gains. Alternative models of financing include public-private partnerships and other external sources. Finally, the financing of investments in resilience and in urban recovery in the post-disaster context gain great relevance in LAC countries which are very vulnerable to disasters, which have been increasingly frequent and intense due to the effects of climate change. Climate finance is not only a matter of supply through new funds, but also a matter of demand for climate financing. In fact, a major obstacle to the placement of climate finance in emerging countries is precisely the lack of availability of high-quality projects and institutions.

D. Strategic framework

I. Global agreements and relevant international agendas

The implementation of the NUA in the region through the Regional Action Plan will have a positive impact on a wide range of global agendas and may represent a shortcut in their integrated and simultaneous achievement in the region.

Importantly, the implementation of the NUA will contribute to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Agenda 2030 in an integrated manner, strengthening the fulfillment of the SDGs, especially Goal 11 on inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable human settlements and cities, but also advancing the achievement of other goals, targets and indicators in urban areas. The urban dimension of the SDGs beyond Goal 11 is widely recognized, as is the importance of their implementation at the local level. Misselwitz, Villanueva and Rowell (2015, page 13) estimate that up to 65% of targets would be at risk if local actors do not participate with a clear mandate and a leading role in implementation processes. The NUA and the Regional Action Plan will play a key role in the regional advancement of the SDGs.

In addition, the implementation of the NUA in the region establishes synergies with other global agendas such as the Sendai Framework for Disaster Reduction, the Paris Agreement, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development, and the Accelerated Action Modes for Small Island Developing States (Samoa Path) due to the interdependence between these agendas and the NUA, sharing many goals. The comprehensive nature of NUA and the Regional Action Plan ensure that they address urban and climate resilience goals, strengthen response to the threat of climate change, strengthen frameworks for financing sustainable development, and consider the specific needs of Small Island Developing States, which are treated as fundamental aspects of sustainable urban development in the region. In short, the Regional Action Plan seeks to be a regional reference, adaptable to local conditions and needs, while supporting the progress on global development agendas relevant to the region.

II. Vision and mission for sustainable development in the region

1. Regional vision for cities and human settlements

The regional vision¹ seeks to express how we envision cities and human settlements in LAC in the year 2036; where do we want to go in the next 20 years? We imagine:

“Inclusive, safe, resilient, sustainable cities and human settlements of Latin America and the Caribbean, that are recognized as macro-level public goods, created for and by their inhabitants, ensuring equal rights, opportunities, socioeconomic and cultural diversity, prosperity and quality of life for all, while maintaining a sustainable relationship with their environment and cultural and natural heritage.”

2. Regional mission

On October 20, 2016, Habitat III concluded with the official adoption and signing of the NUA, including all the countries of LAC. In accordance with the commitments on the sustainable development of cities and human settlements within the NUA assumed by the countries of the region, the implementation of the NUA becomes the regional, national and subnational mission. Likewise, the responsibilities assumed in the Declaration of Toluca, the document resulting from the Regional Meeting for LAC in preparation for Habitat III, together with the commitments of Agenda 2030 and the Sustainable Development Objectives, particularly those associated with the achievement of safe, inclusive and resilient cities and human settlements are key parts of this mission.

The Regional Action Plan has been developed as a strategic and reference framework for the implementation of NUA in the cities and human settlements of the region and seeks to be a tool to support the achievement of the regional mission.

III. Guiding principles, key strategic outcomes and cross cutting perspectives

1. Cross cutting perspectives

The Regional Action Plan places regional progress towards equality in its multiple dimensions and citizens' rights at the center of sustainable urban development. The RAP assumes a human rights approach (ECLAC and OHCHR, 2016) as a fundamental and cross cutting basis for urban and territorial planning, and in the implementation of the RAP itself in the context of the realities of the countries of the region, and of their territories and urban centers. Any reading of this Plan must therefore be performed with this perspective in mind, which is cross cutting to all its guiding principles, its strategic results and the processes inherent to the implementation of its six action areas.

Equal rights represent the most fundamental element of equality and refers to the fulfillment of economic, social and cultural rights, in addition to environmental rights, for all people, and without distinction of sex, race, ethnicity, age, religion, origin, socio-economic situation or other conditions, as well as to the inclusion of all citizens in the dynamics of urban and territorial development, which in turn implies effective participation in society and the full exercise of citizenship.

¹ The regional vision was developed by the ECLAC team based on inputs and suggestions from the group of experts through the collaborative process that was carried out to develop the RAP and has incorporated the opinions, ideas and objectives of a wide range of multisectoral and multi-level actors across the region.

The RAP is guided by cross cutting perspectives related to issues of equality and inclusion and by the set of integrated and interdependent guiding principles and strategic results detailed in the following section.

2. Guiding principles and strategic objectives (2016-2036)

The RAP is oriented by four guiding principles that guide and apply to all aspects of the Plan. The first three were adopted from the NUA and have been adjusted to reflect the specific conditions and objectives of the region. The fourth principle, effective and democratic governance, is added as a fundamental pillar for the achievement of sustainable urban development in the region.

Principle 1

Inclusive cities: Cities and human settlements free of poverty and inequality in all its forms and dimensions, that eliminate socio-spatial segregation and exclusion and that guarantee equality of rights, opportunities, and safe and inclusive access to the city and to its productive fabric.

Strategic outcomes

- Eradication of poverty and inequality in all its forms and dimensions.
- Elimination of violence and discrimination in all its forms, guaranteeing security, peace, equal rights, opportunities, and access to goods and services in the city.
- Meeting the needs of all people, recognizing the specific and different needs of people in vulnerable situations, eliminating inequalities associated with gender, ethnicity, race, religion, disability, age, and sexual diversity.
- Urban land and property that fulfills its social and ecological function and contributes to sustainable development, with costs and benefits equitably shared by the city and its inhabitants.
- Fulfillment of the right to adequate housing and the improvement of informal and precarious settlements and their integration within the city.
- Universal and equitable access to quality and affordable physical and social infrastructure and urban services.
- Safe, inclusive, accessible, ecological, and high-quality public spaces.
- Promotion of security, socio-spatial inclusion and integration, social cohesion, social and inter-generational interactions, a sense of belonging and identity, and an improved urban quality of life through public space and urban design.
- Urban form and compact space configurations, facilitating connectivity and universal accessibility, and promoting socio-spatial integration, mixed use urban space and efficient resource use.
- Protection of heritage and expressions and cultural diversity in urban planning and development processes.

Principle 2

Sustainable and inclusive urban economies: Well-planned and financed urbanization processes that ensure equitable access to opportunities and resources for all inhabitants, the improvement of urban productivity, and the positive contribution of urban economies to national development.

Strategic outcomes

- Encouragement of full and productive employment and decent work,² promoting equal pay without gender discrimination.
- Integration of formal and informal economic activities, extending the conditions of decent employment to all members of the local economy.
- Equitable access to the city's resources, services, and economic opportunities.
- Integration of urban planning with long-term national and regional planning, ensuring and promoting urban value creation and national development.
- Efficient management of financing and investment in urban systems for well-planned cities and human settlements that mitigate negative social, environmental, and economic externalities.
- Local economies that manage and maximize the potential of investment of public resources in urban production through value capture and other fiscal and financial instruments.
- Effective regulation of urban land, using instruments and mechanisms that prevent land speculation and guarantee the social and economic function of land, and tenure security.
- Balanced management between economic and territorial development and urban systems, promoting physical and virtual connectivity.
- Benefits of urbanization enhanced and exploited through public and private investment in social and economic infrastructure, agglomeration and scale economies, the proximity of production factors and networks for innovation, while attending impacts on local communities.
- Creation, transmission and adoption of technology, and investment in human capital and infrastructure, institutions and mechanisms for integration to improve productivity in cities and urban areas.

Principle 3

Urban environmental sustainability: Planning processes, urban development patterns and strong public participation that promote the protection and efficient and sustainable use of natural resources, ecosystems and their services, increasing resilience to the impacts of climate change and disasters.

Strategic outcomes

- Regulation of land use and urban form to ensure sustainable use and recovery of ecosystems and environmental services.
- Recognition of the dynamics of interdependence between urban and rural territories and their integration within planning processes.
- Efficient use of natural resources and promotion of responsible production, distribution and consumption patterns.
- Preservation, conservation, and restoration of natural systems and biodiversity in urban ecosystems and their hinterlands.

² Decent work synthesizes the aspirations of people during their working lives and means having opportunities for work that is productive and that produces a decent income, workplace safety and social protection for families.

- Evaluation of the functions and services provided by natural systems and the impacts of human activity on these systems; the integration of both factors in urban and territorial planning.
- Regulations and programs to avoid construction and human settlements in high-risk areas, identifying and addressing the impacts of climate change and natural disasters.
- Policies and projects for mitigation and sequestration of greenhouse gas emissions by all sectors.
- Resilience to climate change and natural disasters, minimizing risks and impacts.
- Mixed use of urban land for a more compact and efficient urbanization.
- Affordable and quality public transport systems, infrastructure for cyclists and pedestrian spaces.

Principle 4

Effective and democratic governance: Inclusive and transparent decision-making processes and public policies, capable of responding to the challenges faced by cities and territories and of guaranteeing the fulfillment of the rights of all in the city with the effective mobilization of will and commitments.

Strategic outcomes

- Robust and flexible governance structures and mechanisms that support public participation and civic action.
- Multilevel, multi-sector and multi-actor governance structures that facilitate negotiation and collaboration between different scales and governmental sectors, and among different urban actors.
- Coordinated instruments and mechanisms for planning, design, implementation, monitoring, and control.
- Inclusive, collaborative, participatory and transparent policy-making and decision-making processes, framed within a shared and long-term vision for the city and territory.
- Democratic governance that achieves increased sense of belonging and civic responsibility.
- Institutional frameworks that prevent segregation and inequality.
- Participation and leadership that represents the diverse actors and perspectives present in the territory.
- Fulfillment of the long-term vision for the city and territory by integrated and coordinated planning, investment, and development processes across sectors to improve efficiency, effectiveness, and quality of services.
- Public institutions, policies, plans, and programs that guarantee the fulfillment of the rights and duties of all in the city.
- Development of technical and professional capacities for integrated, inclusive, and sustainable planning and implementation at the national and sub-national levels.
- Ability to review and continually improve sustainable urban development programs and projects.
- Strengthening of institutional tools, resources, and capacities to address and eliminate inequalities associated with gender, ethnicity, race, religion, disability, age, and sexual diversity.

E. Action areas

The Regional Action Plan adopts its first five action areas from UN-HABITAT's Action Framework for the Implementation of the New Urban Agenda (AFINUA) (2017). A strategic objective and a set of critical elements related to each area have been developed in order to adapt the scope of this global document to regional realities and development goals. The RAP incorporates a sixth area for monitoring and evaluation, a priority challenge for the region and a fundamental part of achieving sustainable urban development.

One of the primary objectives of this Plan is to outline the fundamental elements necessary for sustainable urban development in the region, as was the objective of UN-Habitat's AFINUA but on a global more general scale (2017). The six action areas and strategic objectives presented below represent the fundamental components for implementing the NAU in LAC in order to achieve inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable cities and human settlements. In turn, specific objectives and key components are proposed for each action area and are intended to facilitate the multiple sector approaches required for sustainable urban development and for achieving the overall strategic objectives and effective implementation of the NUA in the region.

It is important to clarify that this Regional Action Plan does not apply a structural hierarchy and therefore is not to be understood as a proposal, which sets priorities; the simultaneous implementation of all six-action areas is imperative to the NUA's successful implementation. In this sense, the six action areas are interdependent and closely interconnected.

The success of the first four action areas (national urban policies, urban legal frameworks, urban and territorial planning and design, and financing urbanization) is closely linked to the successful implementation at the local level; at the same time, strengthening these four areas provides the enabling conditions for local-level implementation of new strategies for sustainable urban development.

Urban legal frameworks and urban and territorial planning and design have an entirely interdependent relationship; regulatory frameworks establish the characteristics and scope of planning processes and therefore must provide sufficient tools for adequate land use planning. Sustainable urbanization depends on funding at all stages and scales, a factor relevant to each of the six action areas.

The monitoring of urban development processes is fundamental to evaluating and improving the results of both national urban policies and of instruments for urban and territorial planning and design. Likewise, robust monitoring and evaluation systems are required to ensure the strengthening of governance and management and thereby to increase the capacity of these systems to adapt and improve.

As stressed in the strategic framework, each action area must be understood from a human rights perspective. The integral implementation of the six areas responds to the need for inclusion of all citizens in urban and territorial development processes and for the effective participation of society and a full exercise of citizenship, without discrimination based on sex, race, ethnicity, age, religion, origin, socio-economic status, or other conditions.

Although LAC cities present great heterogeneity in terms of their sizes, functions, and capacities, the RAP presents guidelines for the entire region; therefore, the Plan's effective implementation will require revision at the national and sub-national governments, with the need to prioritize the proposed objectives and their components based on the needs and capabilities specific to their context, aspects which should be periodically reviewed and evaluated. Knowledge exchange platforms for cities and countries, such as those proposed for the regional observatory-platform will be important for these processes.

The Caribbean Subregional Action Plan, the first subregional action plan to be developed, presents a model to adapt the contents of the Regional Action Plan and to prioritize areas of intervention, along with the definition of a series of specific objectives for the subregion and of a map of actors and an implementation support structure. Identifying subregional approaches and their application to national contexts with shared challenges and priorities has the potential to facilitate and strengthen the implementation process of the NUA in the region.

I. Action Area 1: National Urban Policies

UN-Habitat (2014) defines a national urban policy (NUP) as “a coherent set of decisions derived through a deliberate government-led process of coordinating and assembling diverse actors for a common vision and goal that will promote more transformative, productive, inclusive and resilient urban development for the long term”. As such, NUPs should be understood “as much as a process, as an outcome that takes advantage of the dynamism of cities and urbanization”. NUPs seek “to structure a more integrated framework through holistic systems that create an enabling environment for the establishment, institutionalization and improvement of urban development and its corresponding country agenda” (United Nations, 2016b). NUPs are “both a technical and a political process”, which in order to be successful and transformative, demand not just technical quality but also sustained political support and commitment from stakeholders.

The promotion of national urban policies as national strategies for sustainable development is an innovative approach. In much of the region, as in the world, policy responses to urbanization processes have generally been articulated from the urban scale, and a coordinated urban development policy strategy at the national level is rarely defined (ECLAC and UN-Habitat, 2016). NUPs do not replace local urban policies, but rather complement and reinforce them in order to facilitate the necessary conditions for sustainable urban development, maximizing the benefits of urbanization, mitigating inequalities and potential negative externalities (OECD, 2017, United Nations, 2016b). In addition, NUPs provide an opportunity to align national actions with global priorities, especially with the NUA and the SDGs. It should be noted that UN-Habitat acknowledges NUP's capacity to address all aspects of the NUA.

NUP processes provide a “general framework for coordination” and serve to align public interventions in urban areas, and as references for sector ministries and service providers (UN Habitat, 2012). NUPs are powerful tools for coordinating actions at the national level; globally, it is common for government departments to manage urbanization process with a lack of coordination and coherence (UN Habitat 2012). National urban policies offer opportunities to improve and strengthen linkages between urbanization dynamics and comprehensive national development processes over the next 20 years (UN-Habitat and Cities Alliance 2014).

The establishment of an appropriate “multi level and multi stakeholder [institutional framework] that fosters dialogue and collaboration to ensure the participation of different levels of government and stakeholders in different stages of the national urban policy process, and the appropriation of these same processes by these actors” is crucial to the empowerment of subnational governments, and to enable them with the necessary resources and capacities to be the key counterparts in the development and implementation of NUPs (United Nations, 2016b). Taken together, existing NUPs do not have a predominant approach but are diverse and derived from multiple origins (UN-Habitat & Cities Alliance, 2014). Since cities and human settlements vary so much in their roles, sizes, geographies, stakeholder groups and their functions and other particularities, formulation processes for NUPs need to incorporate this diversity and respond to the needs and conditions of every reality. NUP processes are driven by multiple arrangements and can take an infinite number of forms if they are to ensure their applicability in diverse national contexts (United Nations, 2016b). The cultural aspect is also fundamental, as it sets the context and dictates the effectiveness and sustainability of its implementation; social and cultural changes “can be triggered from within or from without as complementary forces driven by a series of advocates, whose groups vary considerably from one country to another” (United Nations, 2016b).

OECD and UN-Habitat (OECD, 2017, OECD and UN-Habitat, 2017) highlight the importance of considerations for: “economic development; spatial structure; human development; environmental sustainability; and climate resilience” in the NUP. Evaluations of existing NUPs are based on the following key criteria for guiding sustainable urban development:

- Responsiveness to demographic dynamics;
- Promotion of a territorial approach (in particular, urban-rural links);
- Addressing urban systems (for large, medium and small cities) and connectivity between cities;
- Preparing cities with infrastructure and services (includes public space);
- Promotion of efficient urban land use;
- Fostering environmental sustainability and resilience to climate change;
- Developing urban governance systems (horizontal coordination and vertical alignment);
- Supporting partnerships and cooperation between urban actors;
- Safeguarding inclusion and participation in the process and outcomes (inequity, segregation, security, etc.); and
- Ensuring robust and comparable urban data (OECD, 2017).

UN-Habitat and OECD (2017 * in OECD, 2017) use two classifications for exiting NUPs: explicit (a policy with the title National Urban Policy, or National Policy for Urbanization / Urban Development or a National Urban Strategy) and partial (containing many elements of a NUP but not integrated as a formal policy). The LAC region has experience in NUPs, as is most evident in Chile, Mexico, Colombia and Brazil (ECLAC and UN-Habitat, 2016, OECD, 2017). In other countries of the region partial policies exist: such as in El Salvador, where housing policy has progressed towards an integrated urban perspective. National Development Plans in some cases include elements of a NUP, such as in Guatemala, the Dominican Republic or Argentina (ECLAC and UN-Habitat, 2016). These developments demonstrate a trend towards higher quality urban policies in the region, which recognize the urgent need for greater urban integration (UN-Habitat and Cities Alliance 2014, page 45).

Although there is no general model for these policies in the region, there are common characteristics (UN-Habitat, 2016 in ECLAC, 2016, p. 22):

- (i) Institutional developments at the national level that incorporate a relative sensitivity to the importance of sustainable urban development and at the same time assign an important role to the national government in urban development. In addition, the

existence of an awareness of the need for coordination among different levels of government, in some cases, giving importance to the role of the city system (Colombia) in growth, and in others, giving greater emphasis to the importance of urban policy in reducing poverty and increasing basic needs (El Salvador).

- (ii) An awareness of the need for legal, financial and spatial planning instruments related to the social function of property and the importance of the role of the private sector in the processes of financing sustainable urban development.
- (iii) Decentralization has been a key focus of the region, which also affects the NUP, "in some cases management of land use is linked to fiscal decentralization, the development of autonomy and land management processes." Ecuador offers an example, and up to a certain extent, Bolivia.
- (iv) A shift towards more compact and inclusive urban growth, rather than peripheral expansion. The recent instruments of Mexican housing policies are an example of this.
- (v) National development recognizes the importance of consolidating the system of cities, highlighting the cases of Guatemala, Argentina and the Dominican Republic, which demonstrate "the perspective of territorial connectivity and urban-rural integration".
- (vi) The permanence and prevalence of informal settlements in the region, and their official recognition. For example, Brazil has aimed to address the issue of favelas, recognizing their existence and working to integrate them in situ. There are also recent advances in Colombia and Ecuador, which suggest a development in the same direction.

In general, the region is recognized for its initiatives and innovations in urban policies however it faces major challenges in terms of coordination between actors and sectors in the urban space (Quenan and Velut 2014, p. 21). The progress of the existing NUPs in terms of their development and implementation has been significant, we must point out however, for a real change, the design and implementation of solid, consensus based and results based NUPs that strengthen multi sector and multi level coordination as the highest priority for national development is critical.

The following objectives and their key components seek to advance the necessary conditions and improve the quality of the NUPs in the region.

Action area 1: National urban policies		
<i>Strategic objective</i>	<i>Design and implement solid, consensual and results-based National Urban Policies that strengthen multi sector and multi-scale coordination.</i>	
Objectives	Key components	
Enabling conditions	1.1 Develop medium and long term projections with an integrated focus and geographic disaggregation in order to inform NUP development based on the analysis of current and past urban trends	1.1.1 Adequate capacities and tools to collect, process and analyze current and past data, and to develop reliable medium and long-term projections with geographical disaggregation on all levels, that includes strengthened information systems for informal and precarious settlements.
		1.1.2 Comprehensive approach and analysis for projections that consider demographic dynamics along with social, economic, environmental, spatial and territorial patterns at all geographic levels.
		1.1.3 Permanent and periodically updated national information systems for urban data.
		1.1.4 Open access to information, with periodic instances established for the presentation of results to the public.
	1.2 Strengthen the institutional framework for leading and coordinating the NUP	1.2.1 Political and institutional will at all levels to develop and implement the NUP as supported by an institutional mechanism to ensure sustained commitment.
		1.2.2 Functions, responsibilities and resources explicitly defined at the appropriate levels for urban development and the development and implementation of the NUP.

Enabling conditions	1.2 Strengthen the institutional framework for leading and coordinating the NUP	1.2.3 Specialized agency or supervision through a relevant agency at the national level with knowledge and technical and political capacity for the development and implementation of the NUP and the coordination of relevant government sectors and levels.
		1.2.4 Mechanisms and platforms for integrated governance between levels and sectors, led by national levels that apply a cross-sectorial, multi-scale, inclusive and participatory approach.
		1.2.5 Technical and institutional capacity for the development and evaluation of national urban policies and urban policies at all levels.
	1.3 Establish or strengthen national urban legal frameworks for sustainable urban development	1.3.1 Flexible, inclusive, efficient, transparent and accountable regulatory and normative frameworks and processes.
		1.3.2 National urban legal frameworks aligned with NUP objectives and with a strategic vision for national development.
		1.3.3 Legal frameworks aimed at achieving objectives with measurable and user-focused indicators, established within the legislation that guarantee their revision and continuous evaluation.
		1.3.4 Legal and normative framework which facilitates broad participation in decision-making.
		1.3.5 Training and awareness-raising of relevant stakeholders in urban legal frameworks, targeting both inhabitants and organizations.
		1.3.6 National standards capable of resolving existing negative externalities of urbanization, oriented towards sustainable development and preventing the negative externalities of urbanization and urban development (suitability of land for urbanization, adequate provision of land for urban growth, environmental protection, protection and conservation of cultural heritage, urban and climate resilience, equitable distribution and accessibility to the benefits of urbanization).
	Essential elements of a solid and results-oriented national urban policy	1.4 Establish specific goals and prioritize action for sustainable urban development in response to local needs
1.4.2 Alignment of the dynamics of urbanization and urban development with national development processes.		
1.4.3 Alignment with global agendas and international agreements for sustainable development.		
1.4.4 Strengthening the technical and financial capacities of local or subnational governments with tools to enable the establishment and implementation of local, national and global agendas.		
1.4.5 Concrete agendas for institutional change and required capacities.		
1.4.6 Agendas that set specific, sector targets for responding in an integrated manner to the challenges related to housing, land management, transportation and mobility, infrastructure, public spaces and urban parks, energy, water, sanitation, waste management, economic development, environmental sustainability, health, education, urban security, etc.		
1.5 Optimize multi-sector and multi-level coordination and coherence within a national spatial framework for sustainable urban development		1.5.1 Well-articulated key actors, institutions, roles, jurisdictional responsibilities and resources between government sectors and at all levels, within the national spatial framework.
		1.5.2 Alignment with sector development plans and policies (housing, land management, transport and mobility, infrastructure, public spaces and urban parks, energy, water, sanitation, waste management, economic development, environmental sustainability, health, urban security) at all territorial levels.
		1.5.3 Coordination and jurisdictional consistency in the management, provision and maintenance of basic services and infrastructure according to established standards.
		1.5.4 National coordination for the design, implementation and financing of long-term infrastructure policies.
	1.5.5 Coordination mechanisms that promote new alliances and cooperation between actors.	
1.6 Reduce urban and territorial disparities within cities, between rural and urban areas, and between cities	1.6.1 Territorial processes and plans and democratic multilevel governance structures.	
	1.6.2 Urban and territorial planning and management instruments that establish priorities and identify drivers for reducing disparities in cities and their territories, ensuring the right to the city and equitable access to urban land (i.e., sustainable management of natural resources, infrastructure and basic services, equality and social inclusion, environmental pressures and flows of capital, goods and people, violence and insecurity).	

Essential elements of a solid and results-oriented national urban policy		1.6.3	Policies, programs, and plans that reduce and prevent urban and territorial socio-spatial segregation and inequality in all its dimensions.	
		1.6.4	Public policies, programs and plans to reduce informal and precarious settlements, especially those which are located in areas of non-mitigated risk.	
		1.6.5	Sector integration for sustainable urban development from a territorial perspective (housing, land management, transport and mobility, infrastructure, public spaces and urban parks, energy, water, sanitation, waste management, economic development, environmental sustainability, health, education, urban security).	
		1.6.6	Policies, programs, and plans that take advantage of urban-rural linkages and the economic, social and environmental potential of these relationships.	
		1.6.7	Policies that promote the development of compact cities and Transit Oriented Development (TOD).	
		1.6.8	Virtual and physical connectivity within cities, between rural and urban areas, and between cities.	
	1.7	Strengthen democratic governance and the role of citizens as protagonists in decision-making for inclusive urban development	1.7.1.	A shared vision for sustainable urban development that responds to the socio-economic and environmental context.
			1.7.2.	Inclusive and transparent decision-making processes and public policies.
			1.7.3.	Measures to achieve an equitable distribution of public participation at the local level in cities, for more just and beneficial decisions for all, especially for the most vulnerable.
			1.7.4.	Platforms and mechanisms that facilitate dialogue and broad stakeholder participation.
			1.7.5.	Training and systems to raise urban actors' awareness of surrounding urban development processes, and these actors' roles, responsibilities and rights.
	1.8	Establish mechanisms for monitoring, reporting, review and accountability	1.8.1.	Technical capacity and instruments for monitoring, follow-up, and accountability at all levels in line with the monitoring framework for SDG 11, and especially Goal 11.A, and its corresponding indicator for NUPs (11.A.1).
			1.8.2.	Well-articulated roles and responsibilities for monitoring, follow-up and accountability at all levels.
		1.8.3.	Autonomous and participatory system for monitoring, evaluation, and accountability throughout NUP implementation.	
		1.8.4.	Periodic accountability processes in simple and understandable language for all involved.	
		1.8.5.	Mechanisms for the exchange and transfer of knowledge between countries and between cities.	

II. Action Area 2: Urban legal frameworks

Urban legal frameworks include all legislation and regulations relating to the management and development of the urban environment. Despite progress in some aspects, in general, the main elements of urban legislation in LAC, and at the global level, have remained unchanged over the last 20 years and in some cases in the last 40 years (UN-Habitat, 2016), often limiting access to the right to housing, the social function of land and to the diversity of forms of production of the city, among others. An example of this is the limited number of legal initiatives aimed at promoting an innovative and locally relevant urban legal framework in areas such as physical planning and the control of urban development, particularly in a context of human settlements with weak institutional structures and limited financial resources.

Urban legislation and regulations in LAC have had a very complex development. Based on technical segmentation, limited public participation, and driven by a dynamic in which technical objectives in certain fields are considered isolated of others, the development of “island laws” tends to prevail. Although these processes are a result of institutional, financial and social factors, they have ultimately limited the effectiveness of urban legal frameworks. Additionally, academic perspectives on legislation and urban development have evolved since Habitat II, their incorporation into existing

legislation is however almost null (United Nations, 2015c). Lastly, urban legislation in developing and transition countries is often characterized as highly detailed and rigid, which quite often results in non-compliance (UN-Habitat, 2016).

The rapid urbanization of LAC in the last 50 years has completely surpassed regional urban planning and management systems and their capacity to react to the problems arising from this rapid growth, resulting in land speculation and elevated prices for urban land, urban informality, socio-spatial segregation, environmental degradation, and inadequate urban infrastructure and services (Fernandes and Maldonado Coppel, 2009, p. 513). The persistence of informal and precarious settlements, a situation in which nearly one in four residents of Latin American cities live, is one of the most serious manifestations of the convergence of unregulated urbanization processes, socioeconomic inequality and multiple forms of poverty in the region. In many cities in the region, current urban legal frameworks are "significantly obsolete and inconsistent, generating widespread non-compliance and a growing disconnect between the legal city and the real city" (Fernandes and Maldonado Coppel 2009, page 514). In general, legal principles are determined politically and assimilated into the local culture, particularly with respect to land development rights and real estate development, tending to result in complex and contradictory urban legal systems (Fernandes and Maldonado Coppel, 2009, p. 514).

Current urban legal frameworks in the region do not contribute to overcoming the main regional urbanization challenges, such as socio-spatial segregation and high levels of urban informality. These frameworks are characterized by an individualist approach to how property rights and land rights are understood, elitist urban planning regulations and ever more exclusive urban management processes that do not reflect the socioeconomic realities of urban areas in LAC (Fernandes and Maldonado Coppel, 2009, page 513). The high proportion of the population living in informal and precarious settlements attests to a regional reality that has forced more and more people to face legal regulations that have hindered their formal access to the right to urban land and housing.

In much of the region there have been attempts to implement complex urban regulation, such as zoning codes and master plans. Rather than supporting innovative planning, given that in much of the region, governments do not gain from the recovery of the increase in the value of land produced by public works and services, this regulation has been shown to reflect "a bureaucratic planning tradition that internalizes a misunderstanding of how urban and environmental regulations affect the formulation and movement of land prices" (Fernandes and Maldonado Coppel, 2009, p. 516). Likewise, in many cases such urban regulations have not been properly implemented, due to government's limited compliance capacity (Fernandes and Maldonado Coppel, 2009, p. 516).

In the context of the democratization of the region, several urban reform movements have been in place since the 1980s, which have emphasized legal urban regulation as an engine to promote a new legal paradigm (Fernandes and Maldonado Coppel, 2009). These movements have made significant progress in the last 20 years: for example, in Colombia (Law 388 in 1997), Brazil (Federal Law No. 10,257 called "Statute of the City" in 2001), and more recently in Ecuador (Zoning, Land Use and Management, 2016). This legislation recognizes the social function of property and land, and understands the city as a product of collective processes to distribution the costs and benefits of urban development. These movements have raised awareness of the central role of legal frameworks in achieving a fairer and more inclusive spatial and territorial organization. They have been able to demonstrate and put on the policy agenda the negative consequences of existing urban legislation, which causes the reproduction of socio-spatial segregation and informality.

The international movement for the Right to the City has sought recognition of the collective rights to the city, a concept that has emerged in the last decades as a key part of the debate on sustainable urban development (ECLAC and UN-Habitat, 2016). Regional social movements have greatly influenced the demand for policies for urban inclusion, public participation and transparency at the regional level (Salue and Uzzo 2010 in ECLAC and UN-Habitat, 2016) and at the international level, through their participation in the elaboration and promotion of the World Charter for the Right to the City (Fernandes 2007, HIC, 2010 in ECLAC and UN-Habitat, 2016).

The right to the city has been legally incorporated through constitutional changes in Brazil and Ecuador, and at the local level in Mexico City. Several cities in the region have contributed important initiatives such as participatory budgets, new legislation to access public information, programs that support the social production of habitat, recognition for the right of inhabitants remain on the land where they live, open city government, and urban regulations for social and urban inclusion (ECLAC and UN- Habitat 2016).

With the return to democracy in the region, new organizations and social movements emerged which have generated an increasingly organized, informed and influential civil society, capable not only of defending their rights but also positioning themselves as legitimate counterparts in the development and formulation of public policies (PNU 2004, OAS and UNDP, 2009 in ECLAC and UN-Habitat, 2016). The new demands and needs of civil society in the region relating to transparency, access to public information and public participation, represent great opportunities to support the achievement of substantive changes in legal frameworks. Many countries have enacted legislation in these areas, but their implementation and enforcement remain weak, thus constituting a crosscutting challenge throughout the region (OECD, 2014, page 30). An additional challenge is the importance of mechanisms for training and knowledge transfer from national governments to subnational and local governments, and vice versa: subnational governments are indeed, the State's gateway to citizens (OECD, 2014, page 30).

The following objectives and their key components seek to strengthen the conditions necessary for sustainable urban development through the establishment of efficient, modern and inclusive urban legal frameworks.

Action area 2: Urban legal frameworks		
<i>Strategic objective</i>	<i>Establish robust and transparent urban legal frameworks that include efficient instruments and mechanisms, and that guarantee compliance and enforcement capacity, accountability, and public participation in urban planning and development.</i>	
Objectives	Key components	
Enabling conditions	2.1 Introduce or strengthen a legal framework for the right to the city	2.1.1 Definition and instrumentation of the right to the city.
		2.1.2 Establishment of the right to the city as a fundamental constitutional right.
		2.1.3 Training and awareness raising for relevant actors in society, on urban legal frameworks and the right to the city, aimed at both inhabitants and organizations.
		2.1.4 Legal basis for urban planning and cross-sectorial, comprehensive and national legislation that develops, guarantees and establishes the right to the city.
		2.1.5 Legally binding instruments and mechanisms that recognize, develop and guarantee the right to the city throughout urban and territorial planning and management and urban development.
		2.1.6 Multi-sectorial and multi-level strategic alliances for sector coordination and multilevel concordance.
		2.1.7 Institutionalism that guarantees compliance and control.
	2.2 Establish a legal framework to guarantee participatory, transparent and accountable governance , with binding instruments and mechanisms for the urban sector	2.2.1 Effective normative incorporation of mechanisms and instruments for public participation public policy processes, and in all stages of urban and territorial planning for urban development and at all levels.
		2.2.2 Mechanisms for access to an efficient and popular justice, for either administrative or judicial claims.
		2.2.3 A minimum standard of transparency for urban and territorial planning and management mechanisms and instruments.
	2.2.4 Mechanisms that guarantee the fulfillment of the right to access public information related to urban and territorial planning and management instruments and processes.	
	2.2.5 Effective platforms and mechanisms to ensure accountability for the use of public resources for urban development.	

Enabling conditions		2.2.6	Platforms and spaces for collaboration between the public and private sectors and various civil society actors.		
		2.2.7	Institutionalism to ensure compliance with and control of urban legislation.		
	2.3	Adopt effective legal frameworks that strengthen government capacities at all levels, with fiscal, political, and administrative decentralization	2.3.1	Legislation that assigns functions between different levels of government in urban and territorial planning and urban development, as well as cross-sectorial and multilevel cooperation and articulation.	
			2.3.2	National training programs (for subnational governments) on the correct application of urban regulations and the development of local regulations adapted to local conditions and characteristics, including opportunities for technical assistance with international cooperation agencies.	
			2.3.3	Mechanisms that strengthen the capacity of subnational and local governments to implement effective local and multi-level governance.	
			2.3.4	Measures and mechanisms for the transfer of power to subnational and local governments to ensure necessary local authority and autonomy, including adequate structure and administrative, fiscal and managerial capacities.	
			2.3.5	Training of sub-national governments in the management of human capital, fiscal decentralization and structures and mechanisms for accountability.	
			2.3.6	Analysis of the effects of decentralization processes on urban inhabitants, urban areas and surrounding territories.	
			2.3.7	Legislative tools for municipal financing and intergovernmental transfers from national government, including an adequate institutional framework and articulation with urban policy objectives.	
	Essential elements of a robust and transparent urban legal framework	2.4	Install a legal framework with clearly established definitions of urban and non-urban or rural land, and associated rights and responsibilities	2.4.1	Incorporation of a legal definition of urban and non-urban land.
				2.4.2	Establishment of rights and duties for the use of urban and non-urban or rural land, including criteria for its sustainable use.
2.4.3				Environmental regulations for urban land.	
2.4.4				Regulatory changes in the use of non-urban land to strengthen environmental protection, biodiversity, forest resources, marine and freshwater areas, agricultural land and risk reduction.	
2.4.5				Capacity of sub-national governments and local multi-sectorial authorities to inform and train residents and owners in the rights and duties associated with urban and non-urban land.	
2.4.6				Capacity of sub-national governments and local multi-sectorial authorities for evaluation and decision-making in urban and territorial planning processes in accordance with the existing legal framework.	
2.4.7				Capacity of sub-national governments and local multi-sectorial authorities for control and to ensure compliance in urban and territorial planning processes, with enforcement capacity.	
2.4.8				Training and increased awareness of the inhabitants and owners of their rights and duties associated with the use and development of urban and non-urban land.	
2.4.9				Inhabitants and property owners informed and aware of their rights and the duties associated with the use and development of urban and non-urban land.	
2.4.10				Transparent and accountable processes in accordance with current regulations for land use change (non-urban to urban) that include strategic planning criteria for linking urban and non-urban areas.	
2.4.11				Independent institutionalism to manage disputes, mediation and decision-making when required (i.e. courts and tribunals).	
	2.5	Establish or strengthen the legal basis and binding instruments and mechanisms for territorial planning and strategic urban plans	2.5.1	Alignment of existing urban legal frameworks with the guiding principles of the NUA and the RAP.	
			2.5.2	Establishment of common principles in urban matters that are receptive to international human rights treaties and are operationalized in internal normative tools.	
			2.5.3	Conceptual precision of legal terms and content of rights, to promote their effective compliance.	
			2.5.4	Legal regulations that distinguish between public space and buildable land within urban areas and that establish effective regulatory mechanisms, including zoning instruments that define a series of provisions regarding land use (nature of construction) and the intensity of development.	

Essential elements of a robust and transparent urban legal framework		2.5.5	Legal regulation that establishes areas for environmental and cultural heritage protection and conservation.	
		2.5.6	Institutionalism that guarantees the conservation of protected environmental and cultural heritage areas.	
		2.5.7	Normative structures that require public participation in urban and territorial planning processes.	
		2.5.8	Legal regulations that establish mechanisms of market control in urban and rural areas, with a solid institutionalism that guarantees their compliance.	
		2.5.9	Regulatory framework that guarantees the distribution of the benefits of urban development between all inhabitants.	
		2.5.10	Regulatory framework for urban development that prevents socio-spatial segregation in urban development, using administrative tools that include effective mechanisms to eradicate segregation, as well as the provision of urban infrastructure and services.	
	2.6	Strengthen regulatory housing instruments and their respective processes for urban and territorial planning and management	2.6.1.	Incorporation of the right to adequate housing and other housing rights as essential elements of all urban policies, regulations and programs.
			2.6.2.	Clear and transparent regulatory instruments and processes for the creation and improvement of land-use ordinances and for the review and approval of building permits, within reasonable timeframes that support the development of dynamic housing markets.
			2.6.3.	Regulations that respond to equal access to adequate, affordable and well-located housing and adequate connection to services (education, health, recreation, commerce, transportation, inclusive quality public space, etc.).
			2.6.4.	Regulation that responds to housing and construction context in order to be inclusive, adequate, affordable and safe, and that incorporates criteria for urban and climate resilience, provisions for resource efficiency and the use of locally-appropriate materials and design.
			2.6.5.	Regulation that addresses informality in the land-use and housing sectors and informal settlements, with programs for <i>in-situ</i> improvement and titling in low-risk areas, and adaptations for higher risk areas.
		2.6.6.	Regulatory mechanisms that promote the diversity of affordable housing options.	
		2.6.7.	Regulatory mechanisms to combat, reduce and establish support systems to address homelessness.	
		2.6.8.	Regulatory mechanisms that comply with international standards to manage displacement, involuntary resettlements and forced evictions, and protect human rights.	
		2.6.9.	Regulatory mechanisms to prevent land speculation.	
		2.6.10.	Regulatory instruments that promote urban regeneration and neighborhood improvements for social housing.	
		2.6.11.	Institutionalism with enforcement capacity.	
2.7	Design and enact effective national and local laws to establish and protect public space (including green spaces and parks, roads, streets and intersections, transport corridors)	2.7.1	Legal definition of a minimum of public space per capita in the city.	
		2.7.2	Standards of urban design for quality public space.	
		2.7.3	Urban regulations that guarantee the provision of quality public space and mechanisms for the protection of existing public space.	
		2.7.4	Mechanisms for the management and maintenance of public space and institutionalism that guarantees these processes.	
		2.7.5	Mechanisms for the expropriation of private land that limit the expropriator power and ensure due process and the opportunity for appeal.	
		2.7.6	Land management mechanisms that allow the production of public land for quality equipment, public space and green areas, and good or adequate provision of them.	
2.8	Establish minimum national standards for universal access to basic services and urban amenities	2.8.1.	Minimum national standards established by law, based on the principle of equitable access and aligned with international standards and rights (water, energy, public space, road safety, public transport and mobility, urban and social infrastructure, urban equipment, waste management, emergency services, information and communication technologies (ICT)).	

Essential elements of a robust and transparent urban legal framework		2.8.2.	Adoption of sustainable practices for the provision and management of services to minimize environmental costs.	
		2.8.3.	Efficient provision and management of services to minimize economic costs.	
		2.8.4.	Compulsory agreements between the government and real estate developers to provide the minimum conditions for the provision of existing services in new projects, as well as the incorporation of new land or its transformation.	
	2.9	Develop and strengthen normative instruments and institutional frameworks for the recovery of gains from increased value of public land and property	2.9.1	Explicit regulation that establishes recovery of increases in public land and property and procedures for reinvestment in projects for public benefit.
			2.9.2	Instruments and other regulatory mechanisms to regulate land and property value.
			2.9.3	Accurate and up-to-date land ownership and land use records.
			2.9.4	Technical knowledge and capacity to effectively manage land and property markets to manage their implementation and control at all levels of government.
			2.9.5	Awareness-raising programs on the benefits of capturing the increase in land value for inhabitants and owners.
			2.9.6	Transparent and responsible public spending for public benefit.

III. Action Area 3: Urban and territorial planning and design

During the 1990s, a process of deregulation took place in LAC where the state lost relative power and the market "accentuated its actions" over urban development (ECLAC and UN-Habitat, 2016). As a management mechanism, urban and territorial planning was decreasing, as well as the capacity for intervention from the State (ECLAC and UN-Habitat, 2016). The result of such urbanization without proper planning has produced a series of negative externalities both in the cities themselves and in their institutional frameworks and governance structures. The urban governance of cities and metropolitan systems in the region has been the main challenge of the last decades, which has weakened the scope of urban planning since its implementation depends to a great extent on the effectiveness of institutional frameworks. Today, there is a need for complex governance and urban and territorial planning tools "capable of coordinating the different levels of government of the territories that make up large cities and their relationship with civil society and the private sector" (ECLAC and UN-Habitat, 2016).

The main challenge facing the region is urban inequality, in all its forms and dimensions, a challenge that requires comprehensive solutions to overcome it, involving multiple sectors and different levels of government in an effective way. The region also faces major problems in the implementation of urban policies due to cross-sectorial coordination, where many of the sectors operate as silos, which has resulted in duplication of efforts, as well as loss of resources (ECLAC and UN-HABITAT, 2016). Likewise, problems related to institutional inefficiency and persistent informality have delayed advances in urban land (ECLAC and UN-Habitat, 2016).

The region's recent history has demonstrated examples of strategic urban planning with mixed success; institutional and governance challenges (lack of continuity with changes in administrations), and problems due to lack of technical capacity are persistent and have limited implementation. At the local level, in some countries legislation exists for the development of strategic planning instruments, such as Chile with the Municipal Development Plans (PLADECO). However, due to long bureaucratic processes, lack of resources and capacity, most of the country's municipalities do not have such plans. Furthermore, for those municipalities that do have these plans, a lack of monitoring and follow up, along with the fact that these documents are non-binding, result that they have little influence over local urban development (Barton, 2017). The need for strategic plans that are binding is paramount. Instead of supporting the cohesion of short-term activities and associated instruments for sustainable urban development, non-binding planning plans and policies have been shown to result in dispersion, and multiple legal claims on partial private initiatives (Barton, 2017).

The approval and modification of urban and territorial planning and land management instruments is characterized by cumbersome administrative and political processes which negatively affecting the relevance of these tools. Existing planning instruments and mechanisms are often incomplete or outdated, with tardy processes resulting that such instruments are often obsolete on approval.

The scarcity of urban data in the region has been a barrier to the design and development of urban policies and quality urban planning instruments due to the limited capacity to analyze the challenges of urban systems based on reliable evidence (ECLAC and UN-Habitat 2016). This has been intensified by the lack of information about the social and housing conditions of the population living in poverty and/or informal and precarious settlements. Furthermore, this lack of analytical capacity has complicated the implementation of appropriate public policies.

Existing analysis systems of current and past urban phenomenon and the capacity to develop projections based on this information is fundamental both for the elaboration of strategic plans for cities and local governments as well as to ensure that the instruments and mechanisms have the desired effect in the urban system. In general, urban planning has not been carried out on the basis of research and data analysis (ECLAC and UN-HABITAT 2016).

Housing and land use policies have contributed significantly to the sprawling and segregated configuration of region's cities, as well as to a number of other relevant negative social and urban indicators. Particularly with regard to widespread investment in housing developments on the urban periphery without adequate consideration or provision for the urban amenities and public spaces necessary to contribute to a sustainable urban development and a compact and quality urban form.

As mentioned earlier, a significant advance in parts of the region is the creation of strategies that go beyond the provision of housing or infrastructure, based on urban norms that recognize the social function of property. Examples from Brazil, Colombia, and Ecuador have demonstrated the application of urban planning and land management tools to promote urban inclusion. Three lines of action have been addressed: (1) generation of urbanized land for precarious settlements, (2) control of speculative practices and (3) social real estate development.

A lack of legislation and indicative instruments specific to urban design in the region has also had negative consequences over the built environment and consequently over urban quality of life. In the majority of the region, there are no legal frameworks or urban design guidelines to orientate the design outcomes in our cities. These decisions are generally taken in an ad hoc way by local governments and the private sector, with an evident inequality in the quality of results across the city, in part due to the socio-economic level of the area and the municipal resources designated to urban design. Additionally, effective public participation in urban design decisions is not obligatory and rarely takes place, resulting in design outcomes that are mismatched in scale and are culturally incompatible to the daily needs of the city's inhabitants and users of the urban space (CYTED 2004).

In Chile for example, the legislation relevant to public participation in urban planning which creates instances of participation in the design, development, implementation and monitoring of urban policies, does not apply to urban design (Fernández, 2012). In cases where consultation processes do take place with regard to urban design decisions, these rarely incorporate effective tools that constitute participatory design. These points demonstrate the need for a great focus on urban design as an integral and integrated part of planning in our cities.

Furthermore, as a profession it is underdeveloped in the region, while there are a number of postgraduate programs available that teach urban design, professional opportunities are scarce. This is due, in part, to the lack of specific frameworks that promote high quality interventions and initiatives in public space and the overall built environment. Lastly, there is a notable lack of research into urban design and its importance in the region as a key promoter of sustainable cities and human settlements.

The following objectives and their key components seek to improve the quality and scope of the planning and urban design instruments to achieve sustainable development of urban and territorial systems.

Action area 3: Urban and territorial planning and design

<i>Strategic objective</i>		<i>Integrate forward-thinking urban and territorial planning and design with participative instruments and mechanisms capable of addressing the challenges of current and future urban systems</i>	
Objectives		Key components	
3.1	Develop evidence-based, strategic urban plans at all levels: territorial, metropolitan, city, local to guide sustainable urban development	3.1.1	Adequate local capacities and tools to collect, process and analyze current and past data and to develop reliable medium- and long-term projections at the city level and with geographical disaggregation at all levels. This includes improved information systems for data collection in informal and precarious settlements.
		3.1.2	Comprehensive analysis of city level projections, considering demographic composition and distribution along with social, economic, environmental, spatial and territorial patterns.
		3.1.3	A long-term urban development perspective with links to national development, investment plans, and NUP objectives, outlining goals, targets, guidelines and required actions for achieving the city or local vision.
		3.1.4	A spatial approach that identifies strategic areas for infill development, urban regeneration and new urbanization or the incorporation of rural land to urban.
		3.1.5	Promotion of a territorial approach (particularly urban-rural linkages), recognizing urban systems and connectivity within and between cities. Consideration should be given to geographical location and urban cohesion (metropolitan areas, con-urbanizations in frontier zones, sprawling cities, etc.).
		3.1.6	Collaborative and participatory strategic planning processes.
		3.1.7	Linkages between multi-scale plans in order to improve coherence and coordination.
		3.1.8	Indicative and binding instruments at all levels.
		3.1.9	Explicit establishment of the scope of application.
3.2	Construct integrated urban and territorial planning and design tools and mechanisms	3.2.1	Clear identification of responsibilities for design, implementation and regulation.
		3.2.2	Multi-sectorial collaboration (between governments, multi-sectorial local authorities, the academic sector, NGOs, community organizations, and the private sector) to study the challenges faced by the urban system and identify potential solutions that inform design and support the implementation of the planning instruments and mechanisms.
		3.2.3	A current and accurate mapping base at all scales (territorial, metropolitan, ciudad, local).
		3.2.4	Mechanisms for territorial and sectorial integration of decision-making in urban planning.
		3.2.5	Institutional and administrative competencies.
		3.2.6	Monitoring and evaluation systems that employ qualitative and quantitative methodological analysis, which feed back into planning and design instruments.
		3.2.7	Timely updates to relevant instruments and mechanisms and of human capital in the urban management.
		3.2.8	Knowledge exchange mechanisms between countries, cities and municipalities.
3.3	Ensure transparent, collaborative and participatory planning and design processes	3.3.1	Clear definitions for public participation and binding mechanisms
		3.3.2	Decentralized, democratic and collaborative planning and decision-making processes.
		3.3.3	Creation of platforms and spaces for collaboration between the public and private sectors and various civil society actors.
		3.3.4	Transparent processes and access to information.
		3.3.5	Leverage the use of ICTs for innovative participation methods.
		3.3.6	Transparent tendering processes, including pre-project tenders in order to raise design standard and increase public participation and unions associated with the construction sector.
3.4	Protect and conserve natural ecosystems and cultural heritage through urban and territorial planning and design processes	3.4.1	Integration of environmental and heritage assessments within urban planning and design processes (i.e. building permits for sites of environmental importance or heritage value).
		3.4.2	Environmental and patrimonial institutionalism, with capacity for enforcement and inspection, integrated within urban and territorial planning and management processes.

	3.4.3	Mechanisms that reduce vulnerability and mitigate environmental damage and pollution resulting from anthropogenic activities.	
	3.4.4	Mechanisms that prioritize renewable energy over conventional energy sources.	
	3.4.5	Adoption of energy efficiency measures and standards the efficient use of resources.	
	3.4.6	Mechanisms and financing that protect cultural heritage in urban development, including traditional building materials and methods.	
	3.4.7	Plans, programs, financing and activities for the protection, conservation and restoration of cultural heritage buildings and sites.	
	3.4.8	Strategies and initiatives that promote cultural expression, identity and sense of belonging in the city.	
3.5	Achieve a compact, connected, integrated, safe and inclusive urban form using urban and territorial planning and design tools and instruments	3.5.1	Legalization for urban design that establishes clear and appropriate principles and frameworks for public and private space.
		3.5.2	Tools for infill development and regeneration that promote social integration and efficient use of resources.
		3.5.3	Mechanisms that prevent urban expansion and require the incorporation of urban land in a planned and connected way, considering the coherent distribution of land use and activities.
		3.5.4	Mechanisms that promote sustainable density and mixed land use.
		3.5.5	Urban strategies and interventions that promote the socio-spatial integration of the existing and future urban fabric at all scales and within a holistic framework of social inclusion.
		3.5.6	Urban strategies and interventions that link inclusive and sustainable urban mobility with the spatial urban and territorial form.
		3.5.7	Urban strategies and interventions that address insecurity and violence within a framework of social and economic inclusion.
		3.5.8	Mechanisms that allocate well-located land suitable for economic activities of all types in strategic areas of the city (promotion of poli-centres where appropriate).
3.6	Ensure equitable access to public goods and urban services through coherent and coordinated urban and territorial management	3.6.1	Institutional re-design to ensure a territorial (as opposed to sectorial) approach.
		3.6.2	Effective inter-sectorial and inter-institutional collaboration and coordination mechanisms.
		3.6.3	Application of minimum standards for urban services.
		3.6.4	Programs to improve urban service and infrastructure delivery and quality, particularly for informal settlements.
		3.6.5	Urban strategies and interventions that promote socio-spatial integration of the existing and future urban fabric at all scales, through the provision of urban services and infrastructure.
		3.6.6	Programs that increase urban economic and employment opportunities across the city.
		3.6.7	Programs that integrate networks of public spaces with diverse mobility options in order to promote urban integration and a quality public realm.
3.7	Promote adequate and affordable housing as a fundamental element of urban planning and design	3.7.1	Housing strategies and interventions with diverse options for tenure (renters' rights).
		3.7.2	Mechanisms for inclusive land use that support socio-economic integration.
		3.7.3	Investments in infrastructure that ensure proximity and equitable access to employment, services, equipment and transportation.
		3.7.4	Housing programs coordinated with urban planning to promote and support infill development, urban regeneration and the improvement of precarious and informal settlements.
		3.7.5	Mechanisms and programs that address the qualitative housing deficit and promote the provision of new, adequate, and well-located housing which complies with regulations and meets the needs of the population.
		3.7.6	Urban strategies and interventions that improve housing quality and integrate informal and precarious settlements internally and within the wider urban context.
		3.7.7	Land, fiscal, and urban planning mechanisms that increase the supply of affordable housing.

3.8	Develop strategies and urban interventions that improve and integrate informal and precarious settlements, internally and within their wider context	3.8.1	Policies directed at reducing social, cultural and ethnic exclusion and marginalization, among others.
		3.8.2	Data collection and analysis strategies for informal and precarious settlements.
		3.8.3	Integrated upgrading programs.
		3.8.4	Programs and interventions that improve connectivity and access to urban amenities and services.
		3.8.5	Programs and interventions for improved public and green space.
		3.8.6	Public participation processes, participatory design, and community development initiatives in all interventions.
		3.8.7	Mechanisms that promote tenancy security, a core component of the right to adequate housing.
3.9	Develop urban strategies and interventions that promote safe, affordable and accessible urban mobility and transport system for all	3.9.1	Mechanisms to promote coordination and coherence between actors and levels of government with respect to urban transport and mobility.
		3.9.2	Public policies and spatial urban planning strategies that reduce the demand for passenger and cargo transport and improve the efficiency of resource use.
		3.9.3	Urban mobility strategies like TOD that address urban sprawl through multimodal transport at different scales, coupled with mechanisms that de-incentivize private automobile use, towards a low carbon urban development.
		3.9.4	Urban design and planning interventions that stimulate active modes of transport to promote health and wellbeing, like walking and cycling.
		3.9.5	Prioritization of modes of transport that use space efficiently, have low carbon emissions, mitigating traffic congestion, air pollution, unsustainable patterns of consumption related to mobility.
		3.9.6	Interventions that improve traffic and road security, reducing traffic related mortalities and injuries (in motorized vehicles, bicycles, pedestrians).
		3.9.7	Mechanisms and institutionalization that guarantees accessibility to the urban opportunities for all, improving urban productivity and the quality of the urban experience, efficiently linking people, places, goods, services and economic opportunities.
		3.9.8	National and local mechanisms that favor more efficient investment in safe, affordable and accessible transport for all, giving particular attention the need of people in vulnerable situations.
		3.10	Plan for urban and climate resilience within urban and territorial planning and design
3.10.2	Participatory, prepared, effective and efficient governance for disaster risk at all levels.		
3.10.3	Plans and programs for urban and climate resilience that integrate strategies for adaptation and mitigation within urban and territorial planning and development, and incorporating resilience principles in urban design.		
3.10.4	Criteria for urban and climate resilience and the incorporation of these criteria within urban and territorial planning processes.		
3.10.5	Mapping base at the appropriate scales for planning adaptation and mitigation strategies for natural and manmade disasters.		
3.10.6	Timely updates to resilience criteria and strategies that respond to local demands and needs.		
3.10.7	Mechanisms for consistent and coherent disaster risk management that address both natural and anthropogenic hazards.		
3.10.8	Public and private investment in urban areas and surrounding territories for the prevention and reduction of disaster and climate change risk.		
3.10.9	Adoption of response preparedness measures in order to ensure sufficient capacity for effective response and recovery at all levels.		
3.10.10	Support strategies for rehabilitation, reconstruction and relocation and crisis mediation for communities and cities affected by war, armed conflict, post conflict, forced migration and other manmade and natural disasters.		

IV. Action Area 4: Financing urbanization

In the last two decades, decentralization processes have been carried out in the region that transferred competencies from national to subnational levels. These decentralization process reassigned functions on the expenditure side, without the corresponding authority for taxation and financing. Urban sustainability is closely linked to the consolidation of the fiscal situation of subnational institutions and the strengthening of their institutions (IDB, 2011, ECLAC, 2017). In most countries in the region, the tax bases on which local governments support themselves are weak and outdated, preventing subnational governments from successfully fulfilling their growing role in social protection and urban management, implying in certain countries, a process of re-centralization in the region (IDB, 2011, UN-Habitat, 2012, ECLAC, 2017c). Although the fiscal balance of LAC cities is generally satisfactory, public spending has been relatively low in cities, leading to deficiencies in basic services such as education, health, infrastructure and equipment. Even as the demand for infrastructure is expected to continue to expand as cities grow, many cities already faces significant capacity constraints with current infrastructure levels. While the investment needed varies from one city to another, the region needs to find new sustainable ways to finance long-term improvements in urban infrastructure.

The responsibility for financing substantial expenditures on social programs and productive infrastructure has forced subnational governments to resort to borrowing (bank loans, general or specific uses, or international debt, either directly or through the central government). Although benefits do exist in terms of increased fiscal space, inter-generational equity and support for the development of domestic capital markets, there are risks that the unlimited use of resources to finance debt could result in subnational fiscal stress, or even contribute to a debt crisis. To avoid this, most countries have a strict regulatory framework on loans at the subnational level (ECLAC, 2017c). In general, the indebtedness of subnational governments does not seem to jeopardize fiscal sustainability (ECLAC, 2017c, pp. 112-3): the relative weight of debt is low in aggregate terms, and a decline has been observed in recent years, although during the 2015-2016 biennium a slight increase in debt levels is observed. It is important however, to take into account the differences among subnational governments in terms of debt sustainability, and the possible implications for territorial equity in access to credit.

A relevant factor for the economic development and competitiveness of cities in LAC is local institutional quality (multilevel and municipal governance). Multilevel governance is explained by the institutional coordination between the different levels of government, both from the point of view of accountability and intergovernmental coordination. This coordination differs widely among the countries of the region and, in relation to its fiscal aspects, presents different needs for intergovernmental fiscal cooperation, which may include: macro-fiscal management, design and reform of intergovernmental fiscal relations, sectorial policies which include the responsibility for the allocation of public services and the management of subnational revenues and expenditures (ECLAC, 2017c). The role of governance, particularly for metropolitan regions, is of the utmost importance as it highlights the trade-off between local benefits (such as proximity and accountability between authorities and voters in a municipality) and the benefits of a broader governance structure (reduction of externalities, economies of scale and greater capacity to carry out redistributive policies) (ECLAC, 2017c).

Some recommendations for improving this quality in the region are: to strengthen the effectiveness and efficiency of intergovernmental fiscal systems; design and strengthen multilevel governance for the financing and management of infrastructure and public urban services with economies of scale; solidify leadership and management capacity in local institutions; implement efficient, transparent local tax collection systems and fiscal policies; increase the returns to and level of investment planning; and strengthen local capacity for urban planning and coordination between

land use and transport. Local institutional quality has been challenged however, by corruption and tax evasion, thus diminishing the quality of urban management and becoming a significant problem facing the region (MGI, 2011).

Subnational own revenues are defined as those resources generated at a local level that the subnational government may administer and dispose of. On average (except in the cases of Argentina, Brazil and Colombia) less than 10% of the total tax revenues of each country correspond to subnational levels. There are differences between countries in the relative weight of own resources (tax and non-tax) within the total income received by subnational governments. Brazil's states and municipalities earn more than half of their revenues (almost 79.23%), from own resources, which represent 10.7% in terms of GDP (more than 90% of their own revenues correspond to income tax). In Costa Rica, own resources have a considerable weight within the structure of total revenues (99.91%), despite representing low percentages of GDP. A similar situation is observed in Uruguay and Chile, where own resources account for 63% and 61.38% of total revenues, respectively (CEPAL, 2017c). In contrast to these four countries, in the rest of the countries of the region the main source of public resources for subnational governments comes from the transfer system that each central government implements to complement the financing of the expenditures at subnational levels. Within countries, there are also differences in the composition of subnational finances: depending on the tax base distribution, the ownership and the mechanisms to appropriate non-renewable natural resources, administrative capacities and the tax levels of the different jurisdictions, among other factors (ECLAC, 2017c, pp. 100-101).

Many LAC countries have passed legislation that support "recovery of capital gains" as a means of recovering the increase in the value of private land due to regulations or public investments. However, only a few countries have done so systematically and successfully (Smolka, 2012). These capital gains recovery policies are divided into three general categories of instruments, two instruments of a fiscal nature (taxes and contributions) and a regulatory one. In 2011 and 2012, the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy conducted two surveys of public authorities and academics in the region to inquire about the reasons why this tool has not been used more frequently. The results indicated that respondents with empirical experience in the use of these tools considered that the legal and technical difficulties represent a smaller obstacle to their implementation than the lack of understanding of their potential by the public authorities with decision-making power. Moreover, the recovery of capital gains is considered more as a tool for promoting equity in cities, rather than as a way to improve municipal fiscal autonomy (Smolka, 2012).

In the Addis Ababa Action Agenda (United Nations, 2015e), the signatory countries established a series of agreements and commitments regarding the financing of urban development. The need to decentralize financing capacity was highlighted, as a response to the challenges that cities face, particularly in the area of sustainable urban development. The gap between the responsibilities that local governments must assume and the resources they have to comply has had a negative impact on the provision of services, infrastructure and public goods. Urban development financing is not only about the challenge of urban infrastructure and services, but also about the challenge of contributing significantly to reducing inequalities and inequity within and between cities and between their associated territories. Virtually every aspect of a city's development depends on its finances and governance: the scale and stability of its public revenue sources, as well as the way public financial resources are managed. The authorities of any complex urban center need to ensure that there is sufficient funding to manage their short-term needs as well as to invest in the infrastructure needed to meet urban development needs in the future. An important determinant of whether there is sufficient funding available is the extent to which cities can use local tax revenues and the extent to which these revenues are controlled by the central government.

This action area on financing urbanization seeks to provide actions and a roadmap for municipalities and cities to maximize their capacity to link growth and urban development with a sound foundation of fiscal administration and sustainable governance.

Action area 4: Financing urbanization		
<i>Strategic objective</i>		<i>Strengthen municipal finances, local intergovernmental fiscal systems, and the instruments and capacities to innovate and develop new and improved financing mechanisms for urban investment.</i>
Objectives	Key components	
Enabling conditions of sustainable urban financing	4.1 Establish intergovernmental fiscal systems to improve the efficiency, effectiveness and distributive equity of public expenditure at the subnational level and promote inclusive and sustainable urban development	4.1.1 Political competencies and spending functions that correspond to each level of government and are clearly defined before funding is allocated.
		4.1.2 Functions assigned to the level of government that can most efficiently undertake these functions (according to scale economies, capacities, the principle of subsidiarity), avoiding a transfer of functions from other levels of government that are not accompanied by the necessary resources for their provision.
		4.1.3 Clearly distributed competencies and expense functions that minimize overlap between levels, within a framework that creates incentives for intergovernmental expenditure coordination in the provision of public goods and services.
		4.1.4 Reassignment or allocation of functions that takes into account institutional size and the capacities of subnational governments to effectively and efficiently perform these functions.
	4.2 Establish or strengthen urban governance systems in order to maximize the sustainable mobilization of resources to finance urbanization (in particular, for public urban infrastructure and services)	4.2.1 Coordination between urban planning and local financial planning that provide geo-spatial and sector coherence to urbanization and establish a long-term vision for urban investments to support the mobilization of financial resources.
		4.2.2 Flexible and transparent governance structures that promote the effectiveness and efficiency of urban financial planning and the management of urban services and infrastructure. Public consortia among governments at federal and municipal levels.
		4.2.3 Programs to develop institutional capacities for local, metropolitan and sub-national financial management.
		4.2.4 New financing mechanisms or public-private mechanisms for the development or upgrading of urban infrastructure, i.e., Urban renewal trusts, programs for public private participation, etc.
		4.2.5 Environments conducive for innovation in the design of financial instruments that permit private savings capture for urban improvements.
	4.3 Promote effective local fiscal regimes that strengthen inclusive and sustainable municipal finances and take into account institutional size and government capacities to effectively and efficiently exercise assigned functions and to support capacity development	4.3.1 Framework and mandate to promote the autonomy of local governments in identifying priorities and orienting fiscal policy.
		4.3.2 Framework to ensure intergovernmental relations and distribute responsibilities and roles for project implementation through agreements with public and private stakeholders and linkages between public funding and planning functions.
		4.3.3 Solid, transparent and institutionalized systems for intergovernmental transfers of resources from upper levels of government to municipal levels, that considers both general and specific uses of funds.
4.3.4 Legal and institutional framework that authorizes local governments to use financial instruments (such as municipal loans and tools for land value capture) in order to finance local economic development and infrastructure.		
4.3.5 Local governments with capacities to pool resources in order to facilitate access to credit markets when seeking funds to finance operations, maintenance activities, infrastructure projects or service provision (as permitted by national legislation) and appropriate risk assessment, in order to expand local debt markets.		
Critical elements for financing urbanization	4.4 Strengthen or support the design and implementation of an efficient and effective local fiscal-financial and economic framework for sustainable urban development	4.4.1 Local fiscal management strengthened by modern, results-based budgets developed in participatory processes; local auditing; accountability of public policies and programs, including public service providers.
		4.4.2 Effective links between income, expenditure and medium- and long- term investment programs. Investment plans and policies for capital goods and the maintenance of infrastructure to support multi-year capital planning. Effective linkages with local territorial and economic development planning.

Critical elements for financing urbanization		4.4.3	Design, implementation and strengthening of municipal financial management systems, processes and instruments; design and implementation of instruments to promote transparency and accountability in local public financial management; strengthening of local capacities for effective and transparent municipal financial management; effective supervision of local financial performance.
	4.5 Improve and expand the financings sources for urban investment through new and improved tools and mechanisms to generate own revenues	4.5.1	National and local level reforms to create opportunities and incentives to increase and diversify the local resource base and the efficient use of local resources.
		4.5.2	Development of land based financing instruments: procurement of public lands; exactions; improvement contributions; transfer or sale of urbanization rights; reletting and in general, land value capture. Fiscal and regulatory land management tools applied to urban planning strategies. Densification and re-development of underutilized land. Participatory, transparent and legal instruments for the valuation of capital gains generated by public action or decision, and the equitable distribution of the costs and benefits of urbanization processes. Management and updating of the land cadaster based on market value.
		4.5.3	Financing mechanisms to defray the capital costs of high quality massive transit systems (given their major access to principal urban areas).
		4.5.4	Integrated planning for financing sources, investment in infrastructure and urban services, and urban territorial development (transit-oriented development projects, mixed urban operations for urban infill or re-development).
		4.5.5	National and local-level reforms to provide opportunities and incentives to increase efficiency in the management of public assets, access to capital markets and the mobilization of private sector resources.
		4.5.6	Improved access to climate finance for cities through: (i) creation of a financial regulatory environment that encourages cities to invest in low-emission, climate-resilient infrastructure; (ii) support for cities in developing frameworks for assessing climate externalities; (iii) support for the preparation of mitigation and adaptation projects; and (iv) collaboration with local financial institutions to design infrastructure solutions for cities through climate finance.
		4.5.7	Exploration and development of additional financing sources, subject to the characteristics of the investment in specific public services: tariffication systems and charges that reflect marginal social costs that promote sustainable behavior; systems based on the principles of use-benefits.
	4.6 Create and implement new and diversified instruments at all levels of government to improve access de adequate housing	4.6.1	Options for home financing available to all income levels. Development of diversified housing projects, that group distinct segments of society.
		4.6.2	Cross subsidization, mortgages and financing for social and rental housing. Non-collateral loan mechanisms for homebuilders. Credit for developers, contractors and construction material manufacturers.
		4.6.3	Mechanisms and environment that favor development and licensing, rental policies, home improvement, housing cooperatives, and/or room use. Public housing production and administration based on the principle of the security of tenancy.
		4.6.4	Promotion of cooperative action for neighborhood organization, maintenance, improvement, modernization and/or repair of homes and surroundings. Equitable instruments to channel civil society savings. Use of ancestral practices for community construction and the incorporation of sustainable materials.
		4.6.5	Management of social housing developments and assets through progressive housing programs, microcredits to improve housing, development of new building materials and their commercialization, technical assistance, and other mechanisms. Improved access to well-located urban land (equitable land-use planning, re-development, and upgrading of precarious settlements).

V. Action Area 5: Local implementation

The subnational government has the key role of developing capacities and providing basic services at the city level, through appropriate policies that respond to the local urban context. The implementation of the NUA and the fulfillment of the strategic objectives proposed by this Plan and other planning instruments in LAC face a series of challenges. These are mainly related to the social, economic, political and institutional characteristics and structures of the region. Decentralization processes in LAC have transferred competencies from the national level to subnational levels. However, subnational institutions in most countries in the region still lack a sufficiently strong and up-to-date tax base and the other resources, capacities and autonomy needed to deal with urban problems. These shortcomings produce deficiencies in the delivery of basic services and are exacerbated by the increasing environmental challenges facing the region, such as the intensification of the effects of climate change in a highly vulnerable region, where effects do not respect political borders (IDB, 2011).

Cities are the engine and node of the economies of the region: the challenge is to increase their economic performance and to do so in a sustainable way. While it is true that national policies and regulations have a significant effect on the form and economic performance of cities, the management of the physical environment of urban centers is also important; from local regulation of land use to infrastructure development, as well as the cooperation between the public and private sectors and civil society to promote investment and sustainable growth (MGI, 2011). The competitiveness of the urban productive base depends on economic variables that characterize production in local businesses, where some of the most relevant factors are the quality of the factors of production (including the labor force), the endowment of natural resources and available technology, entry barriers for new investments and substitutes for local products, and the dynamism of target markets. The improvement of this base is one of the key axes of intervention of public policies. In the region, these policies focus on improving the competitiveness of urban economies, and enhancing the development of agglomeration and scale economies.

Thus, the challenge to improve the productivity and growth of urban economies in LAC is to strengthen the areas of research and development (knowledge economies) and adequately diagnose other productive areas to optimize the use of agglomeration and scale economies. Competitiveness has also been promoted through Local Economic Development (LED) processes: a participatory development that encourages partnership agreements between representative actors and stakeholders from all sectors in a given urban center. The objective of LED is to provide a road map for the main private and public entities in a territory, allowing for joint development and implementation of strategies for urban and territorial development (UN-Habitat III, 2015).

There are three key responsibilities of subnational governments in strengthening urban economies. These are to develop local skills, abilities and comparative advantages; collect and maintain up-to-date high quality local data (to identify problems and prioritize policies) and develop a better connectivity with rural areas from urban contexts; and to improve labor markets, and promote efficient exchange, value chains and capital transfers. Some of the most important policies that can be generated in this context are: strengthening local institutions and regulatory frameworks; provide the necessary infrastructure for innovation and the development of human capital; simplify administrative procedures for the creation of businesses, the generation of patents and general operations related to business; coordinate land use with urban infrastructure planning; facilitate, encourage and promote training of entrepreneurs; ensure an environment of trust with respect to contracts and a legal system based on an efficient and secure legal system at the subnational level.

The region shows urbanization patterns with deficits of social cohesion, high levels of segregation and inequality, together with high levels of violence and insecurity in urban areas of the region (ECLAC and UN-Habitat, 2016). Urban public spaces in LAC often do not play a role as a

space for interaction or for community building. The privatization and commercialization of these areas deepens tendencies in segregation and limits their potential for citizen empowerment. On the other hand, public participation initiatives lack sufficiently robust administrative and institutional mechanisms and a transversal culture of active participation (ECLAC and UN-Habitat, 2016).

The LAC region presents a diverse range of problems in terms of urban land management at the city level and a lack of adequate and permanent programs to improve and update urban management mechanisms and instruments. Progress to date on urban land and territorial planning has been slow, with problems related to inefficient and informal institutions and frequent interruption and discontinuity, due to lack of political will to carry out long-term urban planning, and due to external factors that hinder the implementation of urban projects in a continuous and consistent manner (Smolka, 2012, ECLAC and UN-Habitat, 2016). There is also a questioning of local institutional quality in the region as a result of high rates of corruption, tax evasion and lack of supervision by subnational administrations (ECLAC and UN-Habitat, 2016).

The lack of effective land policies and other deficiencies in subnational management, in addition to deepening socio-spatial inequalities, contributes to the spread of the urban sprawl. The rapid expansion of large urban areas in LAC observed during the last decades complicates local management and administration where the urban fabric and the management of public services often do not coincide with the administrative territorial definitions. In recent years, there has been a multiplication of closed and mono functional spaces in the region, together with the de-population of urban centers. The growth of the city's surface generates an increase in the costs of management and the delivery of basic public services. Regional projections foresee an average decrease in urban density of 2% per year (ECLAC and UN-Habitat, 2016). This situation, along with the asymmetries observed in terms of management capacity between local administrations, creates coordination challenges and makes it difficult to define roles and responsibilities for the delivery of equipment and services in the city (ECLAC and UN-Habitat, 2016).

Action area 5: Local implementation	
<i>Strategic objective</i>	
<i>Improve capacities and local instruments to guide urbanization and urban development and promote solid partnerships between the diverse actors and sectors involved in sustainable urban development.</i>	
Objectives	Key components
5.1 Create local communities that play an integral and leading role in civil society and sustainable urban development	5.1.1 Formal and informal civil society organizations with the capacity to take an active and relevant role in decision-making and local planning processes. 5.1.2 Mechanisms for dialogue and effective coordination between governments and communities, which incorporate ICTs. 5.1.3 Urban inhabitants informed and aware of their roles, rights and needs within the urban system and in urban development processes. 5.1.4 Tools and capacities to promote effective participation in local decision making and planning processes. 5.1.5 Organizational and institutional initiatives and structures that strengthen a sense of belonging, identity, community and responsibility. 5.1.6 Multi-use, multi-purpose and inclusive urban space, with adequate public spaces that strengthen a sense of belonging, identity, community and responsibility. 5.1.7 Legal defense mechanisms and judicial support for citizen reporting and demands related to urban development and city management.
5.2 Establish and strengthen cooperation between different levels of government and other actors to guide and coordinate sustainable urban development at the subnational level	5.2.1 Local and sub-national tools and capacities for management and leadership to promote partnerships and the definition of conditions and priorities for cooperation with multi-sector actors, including the use of ICTs. 5.2.2 Active mechanisms and networks for cooperation between cities and sub-national governments to exchange experiences and information, dialogue regarding challenges and opportunities, identify common priorities and align urban development initiatives that include a framework to strengthen Sur-Sur cooperation in LAC.

		5.2.3	Alliances between local and sub-national governments and continuous review and reporting processes to assess achievements and address persistent challenges.
		5.2.4	Flexible public-private partnerships, with strategic vision, geared to respond to urban and territorial needs.
		5.2.5	Flexible partnerships with the academic, civil society and other sectors, with strategic vision and geared to responding to the needs of the territory and its inhabitants.
		5.2.6	Mechanisms for coordination with multi-sector actors.
5.3	Strengthen the continuity of medium and long term planning and implementation processes for sustainable urban development	5.3.1	Long term, binding mechanisms to guarantee resources and establish explicit commitments to comply with ongoing plans, programs and projects.
		5.3.2	Policies and plans with local- and city- level strategic vision and that integrate short-term needs with medium and long term projections.
		5.3.3	Allocation of explicit and long term roles and responsibilities for public policies, plans, programs, and follow-up.
		5.3.4	Regular and transparent instances of public accountability and mechanisms for the recording, systematization and application of results.
5.4	Plan for new urbanization with an integrated, city-based approach	5.4.1	Strategic urban planning instruments with legal basis and enforcement capacity.
		5.4.2	New urbanization that responds to the economic, social, environmental and cultural needs of the territory.
		5.4.3	Adequate and accessible urban services, equipment, and infrastructure in areas of new urbanization.
		5.4.4	Application of risk and environmental vulnerability criteria in land use allocation and development processes to preserve and conserve green spaces and urban ecosystems and their functions.
		5.4.5	Strategic zoning and land use allocation for new urbanization, in line with the local and city level vision.
		5.4.6	Connectivity of areas of new urbanization with the existing urban fabric, through an integrated approach that promotes equitable access to the city, and prohibits the privatization of public space.
5.5	Promote recovery, redevelopment and infill development	5.5.1	Mechanisms to control land speculation and prevent gentrification
		5.5.2	Regeneration and renovation of abandoned and derelict areas for infill development; redesign of high risk areas.
		5.5.3	Infill development to promote appropriate densities, improve access to services, equipment, and infrastructure, and to reduce per capita impacts in terms of energy use, emissions, water, and other resources, including the efficient use of urbanized land.
		5.5.4	Mechanisms for land value capture and reinvestment of profits in public goods in the city (infrastructure, green spaces, etc.).
5.6	Improve the existing urban fabric to promote efficiency, equity, and safety in the city and the city's use of resources	5.6.1	Urban design for the efficient use of primary and secondary resources, with criteria for eco-efficiency applied and incentivized
		5.6.2	Initiatives to preserve and increase socio-economic equality and urban mixed-use.
		5.6.3	Equitative connectivity, security, and in the delivery and quality of urban infrastructure and services in precarious settlements.
		5.6.4	Compensation for relocation (by both the public and private sectors) implemented effectively and equitably.
		5.6.5	Regulatory instruments and other legal mechanisms with enforcement capacity to guide private sector and other actors' involvement in urban development and new urbanization, in order to ensure alignment with the local and city level strategic vision. Instruments that permit intervention in urban morphology in order to prevent fragmented develop, and to create incentives for the use of partial plans.
		5.6.6	Commitment by local governments to guide urban development and decision making at the local and city level, according to the strategic vision defined for the territory.
5.7	Provide basic urban services, equipment and social infrastructure in an integrated, efficient and equitable manner, and allows for the promotion of the social production of habitat.	5.7.1.	Ongoing dialogue and coordination among key actors for the integrated, efficient and equitable provision of services, equipment and infrastructure.
		5.7.2.	Urban planning to guarantee sufficient and adequate space needed to provide the services, equipment and infrastructure required by the city to maximize integration and minimize the negative externalities of service provision (water, sanitation and energy services, solid waste management, housing, public space, mobility).

		5.7.3.	Access to public transport and alternative transportation options, with multimodal systems integrated and equitably provided to all inhabitants.
		5.7.4.	Multi-purpose public spaces with equal access for all inhabitants of the city.
		5.7.5.	Strategies, initiatives and instruments for the provision of basic services and health and education options to all inhabitants of the city; application of strategic planning mechanisms for the inclusion of marginalized groups.
		5.7.6.	Design, construction, management and maintenance processes that promote the efficient use of natural resources, sustainable resource use and the conservation of public goods.
		5.7.7.	Preservation and revitalization of city marine borders that respects the local economy, traditional fishing and the protection of beaches as public spaces.
5.8	Design and implement strategies and instruments for urban economic development in order to strengthen local urban economies, create employment, and improve livelihoods in cities	5.8.1.	Medium- and long- term strategic vision and land-use planning policy based on effective land use regulation and on transparency of the land tenure regime, in order to: (i) coordinate land use consistent with the sectorial and infrastructure development; (ii) articulate infrastructure investments to guide private development; and (iii) foster a suitable mix of high-density development and mixed land uses, in order for businesses of all sizes and types to thrive.
		5.8.2.	Formulation of medium- and long- term infrastructure development plans based on rigorous needs and profitability assessments. Effective and transparent policy for the allocation of infrastructure investments and for the implementation of infrastructure projects. Funding from public as well as private sources.
		5.8.3.	Active dialogues between companies, entrepreneurs and investors representing both formal and informal sectors, in order to understand the challenges facing the local business community. Active support and development programs for company groups in the formal and informal sectors. Investment in the development of a skilled and knowledgeable workforce. Recognition and strengthening of the social and solidarity economy as a pillar in LED.
		5.8.4.	Implementation of an approach to the gradual formalization of the informal economy while preserving and improving informal livelihoods and expanding social and legal protections and support services and regulating the use of public space.
5.9	Transfer the benefits of public investment to the inhabitants of the city	5.9.1.	Territorial planning instruments that incorporate the valuation of ecosystem services and land use in the city.
		5.9.2.	Financial mechanisms to capture land value and reinvest public revenues in public infrastructure.
		5.9.3.	Financial mechanisms that value ecosystem services and prioritize re-investment of associated public revenues in public infrastructure to promote the sustainability of critical ecosystems and to preserve, conserve and restore public goods in the city (air quality, water quality, green spaces).
		5.9.4.	Transparency, responsibility and accountability of public expenditures and investments.
		5.9.5.	Cross sectorial mechanisms of the circular economy to link productive processes at the regional and national levels.

VI. Action Area 6: Monitoring, reporting and revision mechanisms

Another key responsibility of national and subnational governments is to collect and maintain high quality and up-to-date local data and information in order to identify problems and prioritize policies, programs and intervention projects for sustainable urban development. The region's potential to measure, monitor and evaluate the implementation of the NUA and progress towards the strategic objectives of urban development will depend on the capacity to collect, process and analyze data and statistical and geographical information with coherent methodologies, consistent with international recommendations.

In the LAC region there is a significant lack of quality urban data and a particular deficiency in data collection in relation to human settlements (ECLAC and UN-HABITAT, 2016). This is manifested in greater magnitude for the population that live in precarious settlements, for which there is a significant lack of knowledge regarding the dimension of the situation, the conditions of the settlements, and their relation to the cities where they are located. This scarcity presents a barrier to the analysis and mobilization of urban policies in LAC and results in urban planning not informed by empirical knowledge and which often ends with an inefficient investment of resources.

These deficiencies reflect a generalized regional gap in terms of knowledge and capacities for the collection, management and analysis of data and information (Smolka et al., 2007, ECLAC and UN-Habitat, 2016). Added to this situation are the relevant international monitoring indicators and frameworks, which often do not fit the institutional, technical and financial capacities of national and subnational governments in the region. Likewise, in order for the processes of urban governance and monitoring, reporting and revision to be truly inclusive, they must be understood and discussed by the whole community, and technical languages often make it difficult and create a segregated participation, highlighting the need for accountability to the citizenry at large and not just technical discussions.

These gaps in terms of data, information and skills are exacerbated by insufficient collaboration and coordination between subnational governments and between countries in the region. The lack of horizontal and vertical coordination between different sectors and institutions on an urban scale represents another important barrier to monitoring urban development in the region. In general, LAC cities have fragmented management structures and responsibilities for the collection and management of data and information are dispersed between various levels of public management, together with a lack of coordination among multi-sector bodies of urban management. These factors increase the inefficiency in the use of human and technical resources and further complicate monitoring and follow-up processes.

In this sense, an integrated approach to the collection of data and information is needed to identify and harness the potential of multiple sectors for the generation of information (such as the private and academic sector) and the formalization of information gathering initiatives, which emerge from civil society. The region lacks coherent and coordinated national and subnational monitoring frameworks that respond to the priorities, capabilities and resources available in this context.

The rapid incorporation of digital technologies into private consumption has important implications for data collection and presents potential to optimize citizen coordination within and between neighborhoods and to improve the quality and relevance of local information. The integration of local government initiatives in statistical and geographical information systems in a transparent manner has the potential to improve urban democratic experience and contribute to more effective monitoring of urban development (ECLAC and UN-Habitat, 2016).

With this panorama, there are some advances, starting from the current conditions of the information. UN-Habitat has developed a City Prosperity Index (CPI), which appears as an alternative to monitor the impact of public policies and strategies on urban development from a multidimensional perspective that considers economic social and environmental aspects, and connects them with a perspective of integrated spatial and territorial analysis. Monitoring the implementation of the NUA may well benefit from the progress of the CPI in different countries and make an adaptation to the reality of each country or city.

Finally, the continuity of the monitoring processes is limited by problems of data related probity and by the short political times and the frequency of change of the public officials responsible for the management of data and information. Both factors generate mistrust and reduce the quality and usefulness of the data produced by monitoring, as well as impairs the validity assigned to the monitoring processes and results by the citizens and decision makers, thus increasing the gap between the data and information and planning processes and urban development.

Action area 6: Monitoring, reporting and revision mechanisms

<i>Strategic objective</i>		<i>Reinforce human, technical and financial capacities in all sectors in order to monitor advances towards sustainable urban development and for the monitoring, reporting and revision of associated policies, programs, plans and projects.</i>	
Objectives		Key components	
Enabling conditions for monitoring, reporting and revision	6.1 Establish coordinated statistical and geographical information systems to measure and assess urban development	6.1.1	Diagnosis and ongoing assessment of available data and information at the city level and with geographical disaggregation that allows technical decisions at different urban scales.
		6.1.2	Collection, management, analysis and reporting of transparent and accessible information using methodologies and protocols defined and available to the public and that safeguard against the falsification of information y allow for learning processes for participating sectors.
		6.1.3	Flexible information systems with mechanisms for ongoing review and learning processes, and clearly-defined deadlines, adapted to available local resources, technologies and capabilities.
		6.1.4	Formalized participation of sub-national government representatives, private sector, civil society, residents and community organizations, and other relevant actors in data collection and interpretation and in the review and updating of methodologies. Incorporation of collaborative technologies and open data.
		6.1.5	Alignment with international standards and recommendations for information systems, including the indicators from the SDGs, and that include standards for open sourcing, and do not represent user costs for access to public data.
		6.1.6	Incorporation of new sources for data and information and integration of information with geographic disaggregation (i.e., big data, the application of new technologies, etc.).
	6.2 Build capacities for the collection, management, analysis and dissemination of urban development data and information	6.2.1	Assessment of existing capacities and development of a regularly reviewed and revised training strategy that responds to urban and territorial needs, that includes the metropolitan perspective.
		6.2.2	Capacities for information collection, indicator construction and analysis, dissemination and progress reporting, according to international standards and recommendations.
		6.2.3	National and subnational statistics offices with capacities for the collection of high quality and geographically disaggregated information, that allows for diverse disaggregation (age, gender, race and ethnicity, language, among others).
		6.2.4	Partnerships between sub-national and national governments and other actors to promote the exchange of experiences and good practices, peer review and voluntary reporting.
		6.2.5	Definition, commitment and fulfillment of responsibilities for data and information generation by multiple sectors (public, private, civil society).
	Characteristics of an effective framework for monitoring, reporting and revision	6.3 Define a monitoring framework to analyze and guide urban development and respond to urban and territorial needs	6.3.1
6.3.2			Identification and evaluation of existing mechanisms, institutions, capacities, platforms and processes for monitoring urban development.
6.3.3			Incorporation of new methodologies and technologies to minimize the burden placed on national and subnational administrations.
6.3.4			Regular review cycles and timely response to gaps in implementation identified by review.
6.4 Establish explicit roles and responsibilities for collecting, managing, analyzing and disseminating multi-stakeholder and multi-level information		6.4.1	Identification of key actors at all levels of management.
		6.4.2	Active strategies for strengthening the role of civil society actors.
		6.4.3	Mechanisms for dialogue and cooperation between sectors and levels of governance.
		6.4.4	Explicit definition of the rights to choose, modify, apply, review, and deliver monitoring and assessment results.
	6.4.5	Explicit roles and deadlines for reporting.	
	6.4.6	Periodic review and assessment of roles and responsibilities.	

Characteristics of an effective framework for monitoring, reporting and revision	6.5 Establish mechanisms for the coordination of statistical and geographical urban development data and information	6.5.1	Horizontally and vertically coordinated information gathering processes.
		6.5.2	Horizontal and vertical flows of existing information between actors responsible for information collection, management and analysis.
		6.5.3	Dissemination of urban indicators through online systems; exchange of data between institutions and systems.
		6.5.4	Maximization of synergies between data and information collection, management and analysis by diverse actors.
		6.5.5	National and subnational statistical offices with the capacity and autonomy to coordinate and guide actors from multiple sectors and levels.
	6.6 Identify and apply a set of urban development indicators that are relevant to the national and sub-national context	6.6.1	Evaluation of indicators and existing statistical capacity at the national and subnational level.
		6.6.2	Definition of clear, relevant, cost-effective, adequate and measurable indicators linked to sustainable urban development goals and other strategic urban and territorial processes.
		6.6.3	Identification of indicators that reflect the integral and multi-sectorial nature of urban development and that identify trends in urban and territorial development, that permit the incorporation of indicators related to multidimensional poverty and its expression in precarious settlements.
		6.6.4	Clear definitions of selected indicators and methodologies for their application in order to ensure consistency and allow for comparisons between cities and at the regional and international levels.
		6.6.5	Alignment with the indicators proposed by global agendas; in particular, revision of indicators proposed for the Sustainable Development Goals, including the CPI, and proposed assessments of Nationally Determined Contributions under the Paris Agreement.
		6.7 Establish a reporting system to inform national and sub-national decision-making processes with the results of urban development review, reporting and monitoring	6.7.1
	6.7.2		Clear definition of criteria for incorporating monitoring results in urban planning and management.
	6.7.3		Explicit definition of roles and responsibilities by sector for the delivery and application of additional results, that reflects adaptation to the characteristics and capacities of diverse groups of citizens.
	6.7.4		External and internal instances for multi-sector exchange to guide urban development and new urbanization.
	6.7.5		Results of monitoring and review that are easily accessible and presented to the general public.
	6.7.6		Spaces for dialogue between actors responsible for data collection and decision-makers, in order to review and refine methodologies for data and information collection.
	6.7.7		Spaces for public participation in data analysis and improved platforms in benefit of public policy and monitoring (e.g., hackathons).

F. Next steps towards implementation and monitoring

I. Actors, roles and responsibilities

The effective, efficient and sustainable implementation of the NUA in LAC will depend on the commitment of diverse actors from multiple sectors and scales of intervention. The responsibilities of national and subnational governments, civil society, NGOs, the academic sector, the private sector, development banks, other international cooperation institutions and UN-Habitat and other United Nations agencies as key players in RAP implementation will need to be made explicit. Coordination and learning networks among actors from different sectors and at different levels need to be built and strengthened as an integral and cross cutting element to the different action areas of the RAP. The region has a significant body of knowledge and experiences in sustainable urban development, as well as a diverse groups of actors committed to sustainable urban development, all of which should be invested in collective learning processes to strengthen the implementation of the RAP in LAC at subregional, national and, above all, in each city and urban territory.

II. Subregional Action Plans

In this context, the preparation of subregional action plans seeks to respond to the specific challenges and opportunities of each subregional context. These processes will carry out a critical review and analysis of the contents of the Regional Action Plan, identifying the key factors for sustainable development and for the implementation of the NUA in each subregion to provide a useful planning and contextual reference to national and subnational governments. The subregional action plans will set priorities for action in the short, medium and long term, and complement the Regional Action Plan with elements and actions specific to the subregional context, including a mapping of actors in order to explicit roles and responsibilities between sectors and scales of implementation.

III. National Action Plans

The development and implementation of the Regional Action Plan may include the development of national frameworks and action plans (NAPs) as tools for establishing commitments to advance sustainable, prosperous and inclusive urban development at the national and subnational levels, recognizing priorities, capacities and specific national challenges. Like the RAP, national plans will foster policy coherence and consistency across government as well as, if developed within a results-based framework, will lead to the effective delivery of longer-term development results. NAPs should be part of national urban development plans already in place in many LAC countries. NAPs have been firmly established as a form of public policy response used by States to address particular challenges in thematic areas; as such, are suitable tools for the definition and implementation of the national commitments for the implementation of the NUA.

IV. City Plans

Within the framework of the Regional Action Plan, the role of the State as a governing body to ensure the application of RAP's guiding principles, to adequately regulate, to achieve the common good, and to establish and promote the necessary enabling conditions to materialize the NUA for the reality of each city and/or urban territory is critical. The City Plan interprets and materializes the NUA and the Regional Action Plan according to the conditions necessary for sustainable urban development (inclusion, economic opportunities, environmental sustainability and governance) in its reality and context, allowing for articulation with the national and subnational territory and establishing conditions for an internal integration in sub-urban spaces. City Plans are the key substantive part of the implementation of the NUA and the Regional Action Plan in the region. Cities, together with their citizens, are the protagonists in building more inclusive, prosperous and resilient cities in LAC.

V. Monitoring and evaluating the Regional Action Plan

The establishment of a regional observatory-platform responds to a MINURVI decision highlighted in the Declaration of Asunción (2016), the Declaration of Buenos Aires (2017) and Habitat III, which established the objective and commitment to follow up on the implementation of the NUA in LAC, ensuring compliance with SDG 11 at the subnational, national and regional levels. The regional observatory-platform will be a platform for the exchange of knowledge for the monitoring and follow-up of the implementation of the Regional Action Plan in its six action areas and will allow the exchange of experiences, policies, regulations, programs, projects and instruments and mechanisms among the cities and countries of the region, and in turn, peer learning among stakeholders. In addition, a set of urban indicators will be consolidated to follow up on compliance with SDG 11. The process seeks to strengthen regional, national, sub-national and local capacity to develop and implement public policies for sustainable urban development.

A first proposal for the structure and approach of the observatory-platform will be presented for discussion during the Cities Conference of October 2017, held at ECLAC's headquarters in Santiago, Chile. It will seek to inform, guide and strengthen the construction of this platform through the discussion and explanation of commitments for collaboration among various actors present at the Conference, representing multiple scales and management sectors.

Bibliography

- Barton, J. (2017), Vinculante-o-nada-hacia-instrumentos-de-planificación-eficaces, CEDEUS, april 10, 2017, <http://www.cedeus.cl/blog/vinculante-o-nada-hacia-instrumentos-de-planificacion-eficaces/>.
- Blanco, Andrés G., Vicente Fretes Ciblis y Andrés F. Muñoz (2014), Se Busca Vivienda en Alquiler. Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo, Washington, D.C.
- Bonomo, U., I. Brain, y D. Simioni (2015), “Políticas de acceso a vivienda”, in Simone Cecchini, Fernando Filgueira, Rodrigo Martínez, y Cecilia Rossel, (eds.), *Instrumentos de protección social: caminos latinoamericanos hacia la universalización*, Libros de la CEPAL, Comisión Económica para América Latina y el Caribe: Santiago de Chile (LC/G.2644-P).
- CAF (2014), Por una América Latina más segura: Una nueva perspectiva para prevenir y controlar el delito, Caracas.
- Caldeira, Teresa (2000), Cidade de Muros: Crime Segregação e Cidadania em São Paulo. São Paulo: Editora de Universidade de São Paulo.
- CYTED (2004), La participación en el diseño urbano y arquitectónico en la producción social del hábitat, Publicación del Programa Iberoamericano de Ciencia y Tecnología para el desarrollo CYTED, México, DF, http://www.hic-al.org/documentos/libro_cyted.pdf.
- EIRD/ONU (Oficina de las Naciones Unidas para la Prevención del Riesgo de Desastres / Organización de Naciones Unidas) (2011), Informe de evaluación global sobre la reducción del riesgo de desastres, Ginebra, Suiza.
- ECLAC (Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean) (2017a), Agenda 2030 y los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible: una oportunidad para América Latina y el Caribe, April, Santiago de Chile (LC/G.2681/Rev.2).
- _____ (2017b), Observatorio de Igualdad de Género de América Latina y el Caribe, <http://oig.cepal.org/es>.
- _____ (2017c), Panorama fiscal de América Latina y el Caribe. La movilización de recursos para el financiamiento del desarrollo sostenible, March, Santiago de Chile (LC/PUB2017/6-P).
- _____ (2016), Horizontes 2030: La igualdad en el centro del desarrollo sostenible, July, Santiago de Chile (LC/G.2660/ Rev.1).
- _____ (2014a), Pactos para la igualdad: Hacia un futuro sostenible; trigésimo quinto período de sesiones de la CEPAL, Documentos de posición del período de sesiones de la CEPAL, April, Santiago de Chile (LC/G.2586(SES.35/3)).
- _____ (2014b), Panorama Social de América Latina 2014, December, Santiago de Chile (LC/G.2635-P).
- _____ (2014c), La Economía del cambio climático en América Latina y el Caribe: Paradojas y desafíos del desarrollo sostenible, February, Santiago de Chile (LC/G.2624).
- ECLAC and UN-Habitat (2016), Informe Regional América Latina y el Caribe. Presentado en HABITAT III, Tercera Conferencia de las Naciones Unidas sobre Desarrollo Sostenible y Vivienda.

- ECLAC and UNHCHR (United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights) (2016), *Sociedad, derechos y medio ambiente. Estándares internacionales de derechos humanos aplicables al acceso a la información, a la participación pública y al acceso a la justicia*, noviembre, Santiago de Chile (LC/W.712).
- Ferandes, E. and M.M. Maldonado Copello, (2009), “El derecho y la política de suelo en América Latina: nuevos paradigmas y posibilidades de acción” en Smolka, M.O & Mullahy, L, (eds.), (2010) *Perspectivas urbanas, Temas críticos en políticas de suelo en América Latina*, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy <https://www.lincolninst.edu/sites/default/files/pubfiles/perspectivas-urbanas-cd-full.pdf>.
- Fernández, V.P. (2012), “Participación Ciudadana en Diseño Urbano: promoviendo una ciudad más inclusiva”, *Revista de Urbanismo, Universidad de Chile* ISSN 0717-5051 <http://revistas.uchile.cl/index.php/RU/index>.
- Fernandes, E. (2007), “Constructing the ‘Right to the City’ in Brazil”, *Social & Legal Studies* 2007, Vol. 16(2), 201-219.
- Glaeser, E. (2011), *The Triumph of the City: How Our Greatest Invention Makes Us Richer, Smarter, Greener, Healthier, and Happier*. London, Macmillan.
- HIC (Habitat International Coalition) (2010), “Ciudades para tod@s Por el derecho a la ciudad, propuestas y experiencias, Santiago de Chile.
- IDB (Inter-American Development Bank) (2016), “Documento de Marco Sectorial de Desarrollo Urbano y Vivienda”, División de Vivienda y Desarrollo Urbano, October.
- _____ (2011), *Sostenibilidad urbana en América Latina y el Caribe*, Washington, D.C.
- Litman, T. (2015), “Analysis of Public Policies That Unintentionally Encourage and Subsidize Urban Sprawl”, Victoria Transport Policy Institute, Supporting paper commissioned by LSE Cities at the London School of Economics and Political Science, on behalf of the Global Commission on the Economy and Climate for the New Climate Economy Cities Program.
- MGI (McKinsey Global Institute) (2011), *Building globally competitive cities: The key to Latin American growth*, August.
- MINURVI, ECLAC and UN-Habitat (2016), *América Latina y el Caribe: Desafíos, dilemas y compromisos hacia una agenda urbana común*, Preparado para la Tercera Conferencia de las Naciones Unidas sobre la Vivienda y el Desarrollo Urbano Sostenible (Habitat III), October, Santiago de Chile (LC/W.716).
- Misselwitz, Villanueva and Rowell (2015), "5. The Urban Dimension of the SDGs: Implication for the New Urban Agenda", *Sustainable Development Goals and Habitat III: Opportunities for a successful New Urban Agenda*, Cities Alliance, Discussion paper - #3. November 2015.
- Netto, V. M. (2016), “The city as a result: Unintended consequences of architectural choices” en Balbim, Renato, Krause, Cleandro y Cunha, Clarisse (eds.), *City and Movement-Mobilities and Interactions in Urban Development*, IPEA. Brasília.
- OEA and UNDP (Organization of American States & United Nations Development Programme) (2009), *La Democracia de Ciudadanía: una agenda para la construcción de ciudadanía en América Latina* Washington: OEA.
- OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development) (2017), *National Urban Policy in OECD Countries*, OECD Publishing, Paris, http://www.keepeek.com/Digital-Asset-Management/oecd/governance/the-state-of-national-urban-policy-in-oecd-countries_9789264271906-en#page3.
- _____ (2014), *Open Government in Latin America*, OECD Public Governance Reviews, OECD Publishing.
- OECD and UN-Habitat (2017* unpublished), *State of National Urban Policy*.
- UNDP (United Nations Development Programme) (2004), *Hacia una democracia de ciudadanas y ciudadanos* Buenos Aires: Alfaguara.
- Quenan and Velut (2014), *Los desafíos del desarrollo en América Latina: Dinámicas socioeconómicas y políticas públicas*. Enero 2014. Instituto de Amériques. Segunda edición. Corporación Frances, Francia.
- Secretariado Habitat III (2015), “The New Urban Agenda | Habitat III.” Accessed November 24, 2015. <https://www.habitat3.org/the-new-urban-agenda>.
- Saule Nelson and Uzzo, Karina (2010), “La trayectoria de la reforma urbana en Brasil.” En *Ciudades para tod@s Por el derecho a la ciudad, propuestas y experiencias*, Santiago de Chile, Habitat International Coalition.
- Smolka, M. and Ambroski, D. (2003), “Recuperación de plusvalías para el desarrollo urbano: una comparación inter-americana”; *EURE* 2003, XXIX (88).

- Smolka, M (2012), “Una nueva mirada a la recuperación de plusvalías en América Latina”, Land Lines, July.
- Smolka, Martim Oscar and Laura Mullahy. (2007), *Perspectivas urbanas: temas críticos en políticas de suelo en América Latina*. Cambridge [Mass.], Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.
- UNFCCC (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change) (2015), "Paris Agreement" (FCCC/CP/2015/L.9/Rev.1), 12 December.
- UN-Habitat (United Nations Human Settlements Program) (2017), *Action Framework for Implementation of the New Urban Agenda*, April, Nairobi.
- _____ (2016), *Urbanization and Development: Emerging Issues*. World Cities Report 2016, Nairobi.
- _____ (2015), *International Guidelines on Urban and Territorial Planning: Towards a Compendium of Inspiring Practices*, Nairobi.
- _____ (2014a), *Global Urban Observatory*, <http://urbandata.unhabitat.org/>.
- _____ (2014b), “New Generation of National Urban Policies”, May, Nairobi.
- _____ (2013), *State of Women in Cities 2012-2013 - Gender and the Prosperity of Cities*, Nairobi.
- _____ (2012), *Estado de las Ciudades de América Latina y el Caribe. Rumbo a una nueva transición urbana*, Nairobi.
- UN-Habitat and Cities Alliance (2014), *The Evolution of National Urban Policies: A Global Overview*, Nairobi.
- United Nations (2016a), Resolución 71/256 Resolución aprobada por la Asamblea General el 23 de diciembre de 2016, Nueva Agenda Urbana (A/RES/71/256*).
- _____ (2016b), *Habitat III Documento de políticas 3: Políticas urbanas nacionales*, 27 July 2016.
- _____ (2015a), “Battle for sustainable development will be won or lost in cities, Deputy Secretary-General tells Mayor’s Forum” [en línea] 9 June.
- _____ (2015b), Resolución 70/1 Resolución aprobada por la Asamblea General el 25 de septiembre de 2015, *Transformar nuestro mundo: la Agenda 2030 para el Desarrollo Sostenible (A/RES/70/1)*.
- _____ (2015c), *Temas Habitat III, 5. Normas urbanas y legislación (Spanish)*, 31 May 2015.
- _____ (2015d), *Temas Habitat, 7 Finanzas municipales (Spanish)*, 31 May 2015.
- _____ (2015e), Resolución 69/313 Resolución aprobada por la Asamblea General el 27 de julio de 2015. *Agenda de Acción de Addis Abeba de la Tercera Conferencia Internacional sobre la Financiación para el Desarrollo (Agenda de Acción de Addis Abeba) (A/RES/69/313)*.
- _____ (2014) *World Urbanization Prospects: The 2014 Revision, Highlights (ST/ESA/SER.A/352)*, Nueva York, División de Población.
- _____ (2013), *A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies through Sustainable Development* [en línea] https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/untaskteam_undf/HLP%20P2015%20Report.pdf.
- _____ (2012a), Resolución 66/207 <https://unhabitat.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Resolution-adopted-by-the-General-Assembly-ARES662071.pdf>.
- _____ (2012b), “‘Our struggle for global sustainability will be won or lost in cities,’ says Secretary-General, at New York event” [en línea], 23 April.
- _____ (2012c), Resolución 67/209 Resolución aprobada por la Asamblea General el 21 de diciembre de 2012. *Estrategia Internacional para la Reducción de los Desastres (Marco de Sendai) A/RES/67/209*.



Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)
Comisión Económica para América Latina y el Caribe (CEPAL)
www.eclac.org